

R E P O R T

FROM THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

ON THE

SHANNON NAVIGATION BILL;

TOGETHER WITH THE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE,

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE,

AND APPENDIX.

*Ordered by, The House of Commons, to be Printed,
8 May 1885.*

LONDON:
PRINTED BY HENRY HANSARD AND SON,
PRINTERS TO THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

To be purchased, either directly or through any Bookseller, from any of the following Agents, viz.
Messrs. HANSARD, 13, Great Queen-street, W.C., and 82, Abingdon-street, Westminster;
Messrs. EYRE and SPOTTISWOODE, East Harding-street, Fleet-street, and
Sole Office, House of Lords;
Messrs. ADAM and CHARLES BLACK, of Edinburgh;
Messrs. ALEXANDER THOM and Co., or Messrs. HODGKIN, FISHER, and Co., of Dublin.

Ordered,—[Monday, 2nd March 1885]:—THAT the SHANNON NAVIGATION BILL be read a second time, and committed to a Select Committee.

Ordered,—[Friday, 6th March 1885]:—THAT the Committee do consist of Nine Members.

Committee nominated of,—

Mr. Thomas Lee.	Mr. O'Sullivan.
Mr. O'Shea.	Mr. Kenny.
Mr. Corry.	Mr. O'Kelly.
Mr. Dawson.	Mr. Hibbert.
Mr. Ewart.	

THAT the Committee have power to send for Persons, Papers, and Records.

THAT Five be the Quorum of the Committee.

Ordered,—[Thursday, 23rd April 1885]:—THAT Mr. O'Kelly be discharged from further attendance, and Mr. Synan be added to the Committee.

REPORT	- - - - -	p.	iii
PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE	- - - - -	p.	iv
MINUTES OF EVIDENCE	- - - - -	p.	i
APPENDIX	- - - - -	p.	69

R E P O R T.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE to whom the SHANNON NAVIGATION BILL was referred, have considered the said Bill, and taken Evidence thereon, which they have agreed to report to the House; and have gone through the Bill, and made Amendments thereunto.

8 May 1885.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE.

Monday, 16th March 1885.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Hibbert.
Mr. Corry.
Mr. Ewart.

Mr. Kenny.
Mr. O'Shea.
Mr. O'Sullivan.

Mr. HIBBERT was called to the Chair.

The Committee deliberated.

[Adjourned till Tuesday, 28th April, at Twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, 28th April 1885.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. HIBBERT in the Chair.

Mr. Kenny.
Mr. Ewart.
Mr. Synan.
Mr. Thomas Lea.

Mr. O'Shea.
Mr. O'Sullivan.
Mr. Corry.

Mr. *Charles Frederick Green* was examined.

[Adjourned till Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Friday, 1st May 1885.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. HIBBERT in the Chair.

Mr. Kenny.
Mr. Ewart.
Mr. Synan.
Mr. O'Shea.

Mr. Lea.
Mr. O'Sullivan.
Mr. Corry.

Mr. *Henry Bradshaw Harris*, Mr. *John O'Connell*, Mr. *Francis O'Connor*, and Mr. *Charles Frederick Green*, were examined.

[Adjourned till Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, 5th May 1885.

MEMBERS PRESENT :

Mr. HIBBERT in the Chair.

Mr. Kenny.
Mr. Synan.
Mr. O'Shea.
Mr. Thomas Lea.

Mr. O'Sullivan.
Mr. Corry.
Mr. Ewart.

Mr. Michael Glynn, Lord Montagu, Mr. Stephen O'Mara, Mr. Robert MacDonnell, and Mr. Jerome Counihan, were examined.

[Adjourned till Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Friday, 8th May 1885.

MEMBERS PRESENT :

Mr. HIBBERT in the Chair.

Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Kenny.
Mr. Ewart.
Mr. Synan.

Mr. O'Shea.
Mr. Thomas Lea.
Mr. O'Sullivan.
Mr. Corry.

SHANNON NAVIGATION BILL.

Preamble, *postponed*.

Clause 1, *agreed to*.

Clause 2, Amendments made.

Another Amendment proposed, to insert at the end of line 13, page 2, the words, "provided the said County, Sanitary or Harbour Authority consent to accept the same before the terms hereinafter mentioned"—(Mr. Synan).—Question put, That those words be there added.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 5.

Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Kenny.
Mr. O'Shea.
Mr. O'Sullivan.
Mr. Synan.

Noes, 3.

Mr. Corry.
Mr. Ewart.
Mr. Thomas Lea.

Another Amendment proposed, in line 18, to leave out the words "debts and liabilities"—(Mr. Kenny).—Question put, That those words stand part of the Clause.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 3.

Mr. Corry.
Mr. Ewart.
Mr. Thomas Lea.

Noes, 5.

Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Kenny.
Mr. O'Shea.
Mr. O'Sullivan.
Mr. Synan.

Clause 2, as amended, *agreed to*.

Clauses 3—6, amended, and *agreed to*.

Clauses 7—17, *agreed to*.

Schedules *agreed to*.

Preamble *agreed to*.

Bill, as amended, to be reported.

Ordered, To Report, together with the Minutes of Evidence, and an Appendix.

EXPENSES OF WITNESSES.

NAME or WITNESS.	Profession or Condition.	From where Summoned.	Number of Days Absent from Home, under Orders of Committee.	Advance during Absence from Home.	Expenses of Journey to London and back.	TOTAL Expenses allowed to Witness.
				£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
Mr. H. B. Harris -	Gentleman -	Ennis, County Clare, Ireland.	5	5 5 -	6 11 -	11 16 -
Mr. J. O'Connell -	Civil Engineer -	Ennis, County Clare, Ireland.	5	16 15 -	5 11 -	22 6 -
Mr. Francis O'Connor	Civil Engineer -	Ennis, County Clare, Ireland.	5	15 15 -	6 11 -	22 6 -
Mr. M. Glynn -	Judge of the Peace.	Kilrush, County Clare	7	7 7 -	7 10 0	16 3 0
Mr. Stephen O'Meara	Mayor of Limerick.	Limerick - -	5	5 5 -	6 10 0	12 1 0
Mr. Jerome Courthorn	Gentleman -	Limerick - -	5	5 5 -	6 10 0	12 1 0
Mr. Robert MacDonnell	Gentleman -	Limerick - -	5	5 5 -	6 10 0	12 1 0
Mr. Charles Frederick Green.	Mechanical Engi- neer, Board of Works.	Dublin - - -	12	12 12 -	5 9 -	18 1 -
				Total - - -	£. 185 17 -	

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

LIST OF WITNESSES.

Tuesday, 28th April 1885.

	PAGE.
Mr. Charles Frederick Green - - - - -	1

Friday, 1st May 1885.

Mr. Henry Bradshaw Harris - - - - -	19
Mr. John O'Connell - - - - -	28
Mr. Francis O'Connor - - - - -	37
Mr. Charles Frederick Green - - - - -	39

Tuesday, 5th May 1885.

Mr. Michael Glynn - - - - -	41. 67
Right Hon. Lord Montagu - - - - -	43. 56. 67
Mr. Stephen O'Mara - - - - -	52
Mr. Robert MacDonnell - - - - -	61
Mr. Jerome Connelan - - - - -	64

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

Tuesday, 28th April 1885.

MEMBERS PRESENT :

Mr. Corry.
Mr. Ewart.
Mr. Hibbert.
Mr. Kenny.

Mr. Thomas Lee.
Mr. O'Shea.
Mr. O'Sullivan.
Mr. Syman.

JOHN J. HIBBERT, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. CHARLES FREDERICK GREEN, called in ; and Examined.

Chairman.

1. You are the Assistant Engineer to the Board of Works in Ireland?—I am.

2. You are aware that a Bill called the Shannon Navigation Bill has been introduced into Parliament this Session by the Government?—I am aware of it.

3. And that Bill is to deal with the piers on the River Shannon?—Yes.

4. You have heard that this Committee are empowered to take evidence, and to inquire into the proposals made in the Bill?—Yes.

5. Will you first give a general history of the different works, and of the several piers which are proposed to be dealt with by the Bill, first stating what the piers are?—The seven piers are, Foynes Harbour, in the county of Limerick; Killybeg Pier, in the county of Limerick; Saleen Pier, in the county of Kerry; Querrin Pier, in the county of Clare; Kilrush Pier, in the county of Clare; Killybeg Pier, in the county of Clare; and Clare Castle Pier, also in the county of Clare.

6. Will you give a general history of the different works, commencing with the piers in the rotation in which you have read them out, beginning with Foynes?—Commencing with Foynes, I may state that the natural advantages possessed by Foynes as a site for a harbour were brought under the notice of the Irish Government by General Sir J. Burgoyne, in May 1832, founded on a report of Captain Mudge, R.N., Admiralty Surveyor (January 1832). It was also reported on at various times by Colonel Jones, now Sir Harry Jones (then chairman of the Board of Works); Mr. Griffiths, now Sir Richard Griffiths (deputy chairman); Mr. Cubitt, Mr. Rhodes, and Captain Washington, R.N. (Secretary to the Tidal Harbours Commis-

Chairman—continued.

sion). It was recommended by the Commissioners of Public Works in 1836, and again previous to the execution of the works; and the advantage of the works was subsequently confirmed by the Tidal Harbour Commissioners. Founded on these recommendations, Parliament passed the 2 & 3 Vict. c. 61, by which a sum of £84,807 L. was appropriated for Shannon improvements (including the construction of piers, &c., in the Lower Shannon).

7. What year was that?—1839.

Mr. Syman.

8. It was in 1841, was it not?—The 2 & 3 Vict. 1839.

9. What is the chapter?—Chapter 61.

Mr. Corry.

10. How much was appropriated for Shannon improvements?—£. 84,807, including the construction of piers in the Lower Shannon; and the Board of Shannon Commissioners, who were empowered to carry on the works, were constituted under the same Act. The principle of the Act was the joint contribution of the Government, the counties interested, and in certain cases the proprietors of the adjoining property, if they were willing. The site originally proposed for the works at Foynes was to the west of the site ultimately adopted. The works were commenced on the 18th of November 1846, by day work, as there was a difficulty in obtaining a contractor to execute the works at a reasonable price, owing to the construction of numerous railways. It was intended to give a depth of 10 feet at low-water ebbing tide inside the harbour. The pier and breakwater were completed in 1850, and the dredging

A

28 April 1885.]

Mr. GREEN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Cerry—continued.

dredging inside the harbour during the autumn of 1852. The harbour, however, silted up gradually, and in 1880 it became necessary to deepen it by dredging operations, which commenced in May 1860, and were completed in February 1861, 30,280 cubic yards of mud being removed at a cost of 538 £, giving a depth of 8 feet at low water. In 1866 a slip occurred at the west end of the harbour, which necessitated the construction of a retaining wall 58 feet in length along the side of the county road. In 1847 permission was given to the Limerick and Foyne Railway Company to place a floating stage at the end of the pier to enable steamers to call when there was not sufficient water to enter the harbour. In 1881 and 1882 it was again necessary to dredge, the amount then spent being 1,174 £. Estimates were also prepared in 1881 for building a timber jetty 80 feet from the pier head, and extending 200 feet up and down the river; these estimates varied from 2,500 £. to 5,280 £., according to the amount of accommodation given, and whether iron piles were used, or whether the whole of the structure should be of timber. These works were, however, never executed, the Shannon funds being considerably overdrawn. That completes the history so far as relates to Foyne. With regard to the Kiltary Pier, a contract was entered into for the construction of this pier, and the works were commenced on the 7th May 1841, and completed in July 1842. In November 1844 a short parapet was built at the land end of the pier, both for the protection of people using the pier, and to prevent injury to the surface of the pier in rough weather. With regard to Saleen Pier; this pier or quay is situated about a mile up a creek discharging into Ballylongford Bay, and can only be approached by boats after half-tide. The works were commenced on the 29th of October 1843, and completed on the 10th of September 1844. In 1845 a toll collector's house was built, and some rocks and boulders removed. Querrin Pier, or quay, is situated on the north side of the Shannon estuary, and is protected on the south and west by an island and a long ridge of land. It is nearer the mouth of the Shannon than any of the other piers belonging to the Board of Works. The works which were carried out by contract were commenced in March 1842, and completed in the following December.

Mr. Synge.

11. You do not state the amount of the expenditure?—I have the expenditure in another statement. I can give it either afterwards or at present.

Chairman.

12. Will you go on at the present with the history of the piers?—Kilrush Pier is opposite the Scatterly Roads. The works, which were carried out by contract, were commenced on the 12th of July 1841, but were not entirely completed until April 1843. The stones for the construction of the pier were brought from Foyne. In 1861 some dredging was executed alongside the pier, 2,280 cubic yards being removed. In

Chairman—continued.

1867 the old part of the pier adjoining the roadway was underpinned. In 1869 a new storeroom was built on the pier; also a waiting-room and toll-collector's office. Estimates were made in 1880 for lengthening the pier 150 feet, at a cost of 8,000 £.

13. Was any portion of that carried out?—It was not.

14. None of it?—No. I now come to Killydysert Pier. This pier is constructed opposite Lismurray Island on a ridge of rock, and is connected with the mainland by a raised causeway. A contract was entered into for the construction of the works in May 1841; they were commenced in the following September, and completed on the 11th of December 1842. The stone for the construction of the pier was brought from Foyne. There is a lay-by in the rear for small boats. In 1879 a floating stage was placed in front of the pier (access being obtained by a traversed gangway), to enable steamers to call at all times independent of the tide. In 1880 a waiting-room was built on the pier for the convenience of passengers. A portion was divided off in 1882 to form a store for the Lower Shannon Steamship Company. Clare Castle (old quay) is situated on the River Fergus, a tributary of the Shannon. The works consisted of the construction of an extension of an existing quay, the existing quay being taken down and rebuilt after the completion of the extension.

Mr. Kenry.

15. When was that?—In 1843 the works were commenced; they also included clearing the channel of rock and gravel for a length of 830 feet and a breadth of 200 feet. The works which were executed by contract, were commenced on the 17th of July 1843; the extension was completed in 1844, and the existing pier was rebuilt in 1845, the whole works being completed on the 23rd of October 1845. In clearing the channel, 5,418 cubic yards of rock, and 7,922 cubic yards of clay and gravel were removed. With regard to Clare Castle (new quay), it being thought desirable that a quay should be built lower down the river opposite the pool, the works were commenced in July 1880; but in the following October a landslip occurred, which very much increased the difficulty of getting in the foundations. In November 1881 a crack was noticed in the masonry, and the filling behind the pier was suspended. Afterwards relieving arches were built at the back of the pier; but as it still showed signs of movement, a continuous row of sheet piles has since been driven along the front, and other works are being executed, which it is expected will be completed during the present year.

Chairman.

16. Are both the old and new quays used?—The new quay is not used at present; the works are still in progress.

17. Is that all you have to say about the history of the works?—Yes.

18. Will you now go into the question of outlay with regard to grants or contributions from either localities or the landowners?—I will take

28 April 1885.]

Mr. GREEN.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

take them in the same order as before. At Foy new the cost of the works was 10,403*l*. 15*s*. 4*d*. That was made up in this way, the grant was 6,306*l*.; I might call it 6,307*l*., as it was 8,306*l*. 19*s*. 11*d*.; and the amount contributed by the proprietor was 4,096*l*., being the proceeds of a sale of 4,500*l*. Consols.

19. Who was the proprietor?—Lord Montagu.

Mr. Kenny.

20. Where did the 6,307*l*. come from?—That is the Government grant.

21. Was it a grant or a loan?—A free grant.

Chairman.

22. Were there any other contributors?—There were no other contributors to that particular pier.

Mr. O'Sullivan.

23. Did not the grand jury contribute?—No, the district gave nothing. In the case of Kiltorry Pier, the cost of the works was 1,836*l*.; the grant in this case was 918*l*., and the proprietor, the Earl of Clare, contributed 918*l*., each paying half, the grant being exactly half the total cost.

Chairman.

24. Was there no contribution in that case?—There was no contribution except the contribution by the proprietor; there was none from the district. With regard to Saleen Lough, the total cost of the works was 1,811*l*.; the grant was 891*l*.; and the contribution by the proprietors was 920*l*.

Mr. O'Shea.

25. How many proprietors were there?—There were three in this case: S. R. Colles, 504*l*.; the representatives of M. Black, 185*l*.; and Trinity College, 220*l*. I think the figures I have given will just total to a pound difference from the others in consequence of the odd shillings being omitted.

Chairman.

26. With regard to Querrin Pier, what do you state?—Querrin Pier is the next one; and the cost of the works was 1,160*l*. In this case, the half of it was a grant of 580*l*., and 580*l*. was contributed by the proprietors, W. and R. Borough. Then with regard to Kilrush Harbour, the cost of the works was 8,890*l*.; the amount of the grant was 4,390*l*.; and the district contributed 4,500*l*.; this is the first case in which a district contributed; and the proprietor, Colonel Vandeleur, also contributed 2,160*l*.

27. What is the area of the district?—I have no particulars as to what the district was. I presume it was the barony. In the case of Killybegert Pier, the cost of the works was 1,586*l*.; of which the grant was 1,322*l*. 3*s*. 4*d*., and the district paid 264*l*. This 264*l*. was to have been contributed by Mr. John Bladen Scott; but was lost on his failure, and was then given by the O.S.R.

Chairman—continued.

district. In the case of Clare Castle, the cost of the works was 4,184*l*., the grant was 1,304*l*., and the district gave 2,780*l*., nothing being contributed by the proprietors.

Mr. Kenny.

28. That is for the old quay?—Yes.

29. Can you give us the cost of the new quay?—The works for the new quay are still in progress.

30. Have you not an estimate of the cost of the works?—The amount of the estimate is 7,083*l*.

Chairman.

31. Is that the estimate of the total cost?—The sum of 7,083*l*. being applied in these works for extending this pier since 1860, will be a charge against the funds of the Shannon Navigation.

Mr. Kenny.

32. How do you propose to raise that?—It is being charged against the funds of the Shannon Navigation.

Chairman.

33. Will you now state the receipts and charges of these piers brought down to the present time, at least to the end of last year?—I have the gross receipts from the beginning, if you want them, for each harbour.

34. Will you please give them separately?—I have it for five years, in addition with a little more detail, but I have it in the gross sum for the whole period. I will give now a statement of the receipts and expenditure from the year 1840 to the year 1884, ending the 31st of December.

35. That is for 34 years?—For 44 years; some of them have not been open quite so long; it is from the time they were completed to the end of last year. In the case of Foy new the receipts were 1,752*l*. and the expenditure was 3,494*l*.; in the case of Kiltorry the receipts were 39*l*., and the expenditure was 403*l*.; in the case of Saleen the receipts were 1,477*l*. and the expenditure was 1,016*l*.; in the case of Querrin the receipts were 424*l*. and the expenditure was 771*l*.; in the case of Kilrush the receipts were 5,036*l*., and the expenditure was 8,452*l*.; in the case of Killybegert the receipts were 165*l*., and the expenditure was 848*l*.; and in the case of Clare Castle the receipts were 4,871*l*., and the expenditure was 3,349*l*. In this case the receipts are chargeable with the cost and interest of works of improvement, which are estimated to amount to 7,083*l*.

36. Of the new quay, that is to say?—Yes, of the new quay. There are no receipts, of course, on the new quay.

Mr. Kenny.

37. But the receipts of the old pier are given to pay for the cost of the new pier?—The receipts of the old pier are given to pay for the cost of the new pier, which is merely an extension of it.

38. Have

A 2

28 April 1865.]

Mr. GREEN.

[Continued.]

Chairman.

38. Have you also a detailed account of the past five years?—I have now a statement of the last five years. I do not know whether it contains too many figures for me to read them out.

39. Please give the five years first?—At Foynes the gross receipts for the five years were 578*l.*, and the gross expenditure was 1,540*l.*, including the cost of dredging; at Kiltarry Pier the gross receipts were 2*l.* 4*s.* 9*d.*, and the expenditure was 48*l.* 10*s.* There is no toll collector at all there; it is practically a disused pier; and in the last year that tolls were taken, there were 2*s.* taken. At Saleen Pier the gross receipts for the five years were 162*l.*, and the gross expenditure was 177*l.*; at Querrin the gross receipts for the five years were 32*l.*, and the expenditure was 95*l.*; at Kilrush the gross receipts for the five years were 896*l.*, and the gross expenditure was 358*l.*; at Killybeg the gross receipts were 97*l.*, and the gross expenditure was 226*l.*; at Clare Castle the gross receipts were 1,425*l.*, and the gross expenditure was 480*l.* Perhaps I should mention here that the expenditure was not bound to be kept separate for each pier, and therefore some of the general charges had to be apportioned in a more or less arbitrary manner. It is impossible to give the exact expenditure on each pier, because of the general charges that have to be distributed.

40. You have the details of last year's traffic?—I have the details of last year, giving the number of vessels and the tonnage, and the dues for each month, and I have also a description of the traffic.

40*. Will you please to give us that for each pier?—Foynes; the number of vessels, both inwards and outwards, was 200; the tonnage inwards was 7,042 tons, and outwards 1,702 tons. Perhaps I had better mention here that the chief items were coal, lumber, and fish in this case. With regard to Kiltarry, I must mention that there is no return; there is no toll collected there.

Mr. Smyth.

41. And what are the receipts at Foynes?—The money amounted to 114*l.* in round numbers.

Mr. Kenny.

42. That is for the one year?—For the year 1864.

Mr. Smyth.

43. And what is the expenditure?—The expenditure was 125*l.* in that year.

44. Then that does not pay its way?—No.

45. Was any dredging done last year?—There was not any dredging done. In the case of Kiltarry there is no return, of course. In the case of Saleen Pier there were 95 vessels; the tonnage inwards was 1,805, and outwards 854; the nature of the traffic principally was flour, coal, and pigs inwards, and outwards turf and cattle; those are the principal items. The dues I have on another return; I did not know you would take them at the same time; but the receipts are 28*l.* in round numbers.

Mr. Kenny.

46. And what was the expenditure?—The expenditure was 44*l.* Then at Querrin there were 26 vessels; the tonnage inwards was 4 tons, and the tonnage outwards was 618 tons, the traffic being principally turf.

47. It does not appear what the 4 tons apply to?—It is to timber.

Chairman.

48. What are the receipts and expenditure in this case?—The receipts are 4*l.*; I do not know whether, in this small amount, I ought to give the shillings or not. The expenditure was 17*l.* Then at Kilrush there were 496 vessels, the inward tonnage being 8,026, and the outward 1,820; the traffic inwards was principally coal, wheat, and flour, and a very miscellaneous traffic which could not be separated; it had to be lumped together; the outward traffic was chiefly pigs and cattle.

49. What were the receipts in this case?—The receipts were 192*l.*, and the expenditure was 68*l.* At Killybeg there were 48 vessels besides the Limerick steamer that calls regularly; I have no return of the number of times it calls.

Mr. O'Shea.

50. Have you included the Limerick steamer in the case of Kilrush?—No, that is not including the steamer. At Killybeg there were 48 vessels besides the passenger steamer.

Mr. Smyth.

51. Exclusive of the steamer?—Exclusive of the steamer. The inward tonnage was 814, and the outwards was 128; the inwards being principally coals and miscellaneous traffic, and the outward traffic is principally pigs and sheep, the tonnage being a very small proportion. There is no particular traffic that I can specify.

Chairman.

52. You have not given us the receipts and expenditure in this case?—At Killybeg the receipts were 24*l.* and the expenditure 37*l.* At Clare Castle there were 161 vessels, besides 1,011 rafts. These rafts are a special traffic in limestone for the Clare Slob Works, and therefore they are kept separate.

Mr. Smyth.

53. They are merely for carrying on the works, are they not?—Yes; I believe they pay wharfage.

54. What is the number of the vessels you have stated?—161. The inward tonnage was 17,862, and the outward tonnage I am afraid I must separate, as I have the rafts included.

Mr. Kenny.

55. Those rafts have no connection with the pier itself; do they not belong to the Clare slob lands?—They do.

Chairman.

56. Do they pay dues?—Yes, and therefore they ought to be counted. The outward traffic altogether was 20,653 tons, but of that more than 18,000

28 April 1885.]

Mr. GREEN.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

18,000 was this stone in the rafts, 18,630 tons being limestone taken down to those works, which probably is nearly the whole of the traffic. There might have been a little other stone included with it. The inward traffic was principally coal, timber, wheat, and flour.

57. And what were the receipts in this case?—The receipts at Clare Castle were 274*l*, and the expenditure was 136*l*. That is the account of the whole of the pier so far as traffic is concerned.

58. You have lately inspected all these piers, I believe, the week before last; will you just give the Committee a short statement as to the condition in which you found them?—With regard to Foyness Pier the coping (and two courses of masonry underneath) at the pier head, and for a short distance on the west side of the pier adjacent to the head, has been displaced, although not removed. The retaining wall between the harbour and the road at the south-west side of the harbour also requires some slight repairs. As far as I could ascertain, these defects are of long standing. The portions that were recently dredged inside the harbour have silted up again to nearly their former level. To repair the masonry of the pier and retaining wall and to reset the coping at and adjacent to the pier head (exclusive of dredging) would cost about 55*l*. I may, perhaps, add that those little defects which I have mentioned are no detriment to the pier; they are merely a little bit unsightly, the courses of masonry being open, and it has been like it for nine or ten years.

59. Have you the estimated cost of dredging?—I have not; the sums would vary so much in accordance with the accommodation that was given.

Mr. O'Sullivan.

60. It wants dredging, does it not?—Yes; to enable vessels to come in, it certainly does.

Mr. Synan.

61. What was the cost of the last dredging?—The cost of the dredging in 1881-82 was 1,174*l*.

62. And that did not bring it down to the original level?—It did not.

Mr. Kenny.

63. How long is it since it had been dredged before?—The last time it was dredged previously was in 1860-61.

Chairman.

64. Can you state what the depth is below low water?—The bottom at present is over low-water in the harbour.

Mr. Synan.

65. At Foyness?—Yes, at Foyness.

66. It ought to be 10 feet below low-water, ought it not?—It was originally constructed to be 10 feet below low-water.

67. Now it is above low-water?—Certainly.

68. How many feet above is it?—It varies; at the pier head it is near a wash with low-water, and at the other end, at the extreme land end, it is about 8 feet above low-water; that is 350 feet from the pier head.

Q. 89.

Mr. Carry.

69. I presume that this silt from the *dériv* coming down the harbour?—The harbour is entirely enclosed, and therefore naturally there is a deposit of mud.

Chairman.

70. Is it not the case that this pier has been continually silted up from the very first commencement of it?—It has been continually silted up. It was dredged at the date I gave just now, 1860-61; and then, recently, it has been dredged again, at an expenditure of 1,174*l*.

Mr. Synan.

71. How would you propose to repair that without dredging; you say that dredging is useless?—The only other way of supplying the want is by a floating stage, connected by a gang-way with the pier.

72. Running out into the river, you mean?—Yes; that is the only way to do it, unless the pier is actually extended out into the river. Estimates have been made for putting a jetty out in the manner described in the statement which I have made, varying from 2,500*l* to 5,280*l*, according to the accommodation; that was to run out 80 feet, and to have a T-head to it.

Mr. Carry.

73. Running like a turn-out?—Running out from the pier-head in this way (*describing it*), making a longer return for vessels to come alongside; the Shannon running in that direction (*describing it*).

Chairman.

74. How long is it since that was suggested?—I think it was in 1881 or 1882.

Mr. Kenny.

75. Was that want that you are speaking of supplied by the Board of Works originally?—Yes.

Mr. Synan.

76. Do you care to suggest any other mode of doing it than by the jetty?—The only other mode is either by constantly dredging or keeping a floating stage there, or continuing the pier out to whatever depth of water might be necessary. The depth that it was proposed to go to then, I think, was 9 feet 6 inches, or 10 feet in front of the timber jetty; of course, if that was done in masonry, and taken out into a little deeper water, it would cost from 9,000*l* to 15,000*l*, according to the accommodation which was to be provided.

77. Unless it were taken out to deep water it would silt up again?—I do not think it would silt at the pier head; the part that silts is enclosed. I do not know whether you know the locality.

78. Oh, yes, I know that the harbour is enclosed?—The part outside, which is in the current of the Shannon, would not silt up; but, on the contrary, it would have a tendency to scour; there would be more tendency to be undermined.

A 3

79. Will

28 April 1885.]

Mr. GREEN.

[Continued.]

Chairman.

79. Will you now go on to the next pier?—The next pier is Killycory. This pier is sorely ever used, and no tolls are collected. Near the north-west quoin of the pier-head, about 10 square yards of a hard paving has been displaced, and some slight repairs are required to the roughly pitched slope at the land end of the approach road; to repair the wharf paving and pitching would cost 18*l*. These defects are no real detriment to the pier; the paving which has been taken up is not of the size enclosed within the table here.

Mr. KENNY.

80. How was that removed?—I do not know. A portion is still in the water just underneath. It might have been taken away by a very heavy gale. The water must come over when there are very heavy waves at the pier head.

Chairman.

81. What is the next pier?—The next is the Saleen Pier. The surface of the quay is flagged with very large flags. These flags are slightly lower than the coping (about 2*ft*); but chases have been cut through some of the coping joints to let off the water. It would, in my opinion, be an unnecessary expense to raise all the flags. No other repairs are required.

Mr. SYMON.

82. The repairs that are required are not necessary, you say?—I do not think I stated that repairs are required.

83. You stated that some things were wanted, but that you did not think them necessary?—I merely stated, as a matter of fact, that the flagging of the pier is a little lower than the coping, but the advantages to be gained would not be commensurate with the cost.

Chairman.

84. Now will you go on with the next?—The next is the Querrin Pier. A few coping stones require resetting at the north-east end of the wharf; the pitched slope to the causeway to the north-west of the wharf requires some slight repairs; and the surface of the quay requires some metalling. A defective mooring ring should also be repaired. The above repairs will cost 16*l*. Then at Killycory, the wharf-wall wants pinning near the land end; a few stones in the sea wall are displaced; the joints of the flagged wharf pavement are very much worn between the outer east and the pierhead; and some dredging is required between the two outer flights of steps. The above repairs would cost 160*l*. At Killycory the wharf pavement has sunk slightly in two places; one step requires resetting, and the wall on the west side of the approach requires a little pinning. The above repairs would cost 16*l*. The floating stage which was placed here some years ago, is in bad repair, and necessitates frequent pumping. A new bulk will soon be required at a cost of, say, 200*l*.

85. Was that floating stage placed there by the Board of Works?—Yes; it was in a similar way to the Foynes Pier to enable the steamers to come alongside at low tides. At Clare Castle, old

Chairman—continued.

quay, no repairs are required. All the piers referred to are in very good repair, with the exception of the small defects enumerated, which can all be repaired (exclusive of dredging at Killycory, and a bulk for Killycory) for about 160*l*. That is the general statement that I wish to make. These repairs are of very minor importance except the dredging at Killycory and the bulk at Killycory.

Mr. KENNY.

86. When you speak of Clare Castle, do you know whether the bed of the River Fergus requires dredging down there; it is with reference to the necessity for expenditure in connection with the old quay that I ask the question?—Do you mean immediately opposite the old quay?

87. No; I mean the river bed?—The estuary is very shallow for two or three miles; there are only some four or five feet of water in it.

88. So that in the event of this pier being handed over to the local authority, it would be necessary for them to take into consideration the question of dredging the estuary of the Fergus?—Yes, if they want a greater depth of water; I am merely speaking of the dredging opposite the pier. At Clare Castle, new quay, a continuous row of sheet piling has been driven in front of the quay for its entire length, down to the rock. The excavation for one of the square piers in front of the quay has also been taken out (within a sheet pile dam) nearly down to the rock. It has been taken right down to the hard bottom since I was there myself; it is anticipated that all the works will be completed during the present year.

Chairman.

89. Is it with reference to all the works at the new quay that you say they will be let for use at the end of the present year?—Yes, the works will be completed at the end of the present year.

Mr. KENNY.

90. What additional expenditure would there be in that case?—There will be a total expenditure of 7,043*l*.

91. The original scheme was for 5,000*l*, was it not?—Previously to this it was 5,033*l*, and now there are 2,000*l* for doing those works.

92. It is necessary to separate the 7,043*l* into the two items then?—Yes.

Chairman.

93. You have now, I believe, gone through the whole of the particulars which you have with you; is there anything else that you wish to state to the Committee with respect to these piers before I put a question to you as to the transfer of these piers?—The only other question is as to the actual rates and tolls that are charged.

94. Have you any statement to make upon that subject?—I was merely going to hand in one of the printed tables.

95. Do the tolls differ at different piers?—No, they are the same at all the piers.

96. Will you please put in one of the statements?

28 April 1863.]

Mr. GREEN.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

ments?—The statement which I have here happens to be with reference to Kiltceary, where they charge no tolls; but in the other cases they are all the same, so that it does not make any difference. (*The statement was delivered in.*)

Mr. Sween.

97. Are the tolls the same as they are in the schedule to the Bill?—Exactly the same.

Mr. Keay.

98. Those are the present rates, I suppose?—Yes, the same as in the schedule.

99. Could you say whether the import dues at the different piers down the Shannon are the same as they are at Limerick Harbour itself?—I believe they are lower; but I have not a copy of the Limerick dues with me.

Chairman.

100. You are not, of course, proposing to state to the Committee what the policy is with respect to the transfer of these piers; but I suppose you can state to the Committee which are the piers it is proposed to transfer to the local authorities, on which, I believe, there is no difference of opinion?—It is proposed to transfer the following piers to the counties; Killadysort and Querrin Piers to the County Clare; Kiltceary Pier to the County of Limerick; and Saloon Pier to the County of Kerry; the other three piers, Kilrush, Clare Castle, and Foynes, it is proposed to transfer to some local authorities; what local authorities will be ultimately determined upon, I am not prepared to state.

101. And those local authorities are to be determined hereafter?—Yes.

Mr. O'Shea.

102. They do not exist, in fact?—I do not know about that.

Chairman.

103. Does anything further occur to you at the present moment that you wish to state to the Committee?—Nothing further occurs to me that it is necessary to state.

Mr. Lee.

104. Is it Foynes Pier which silt up chiefly?—Yes.

105. Do any of the other piers silt up?—Kilrush Pier are you referring to.

106. Does Kilrush Pier silt up as well?—There is a little silting up; I think, in fact, a great deal of that is caused by the paddles of the steamers; a little bank there requires to be moved.

107. It is not a serious matter, I suppose?—No. It has been removed once before, and it is not a very expensive job or a very serious one.

Mr. O'Shea.

108. What dredgers are used; have you got a dredger on the Shannon for all those places?—Not at the different places; but the Shannon dredger was brought down to do the dredging at Foynes last time.

109. You have to keep it at Limerick, I suppose.

Mr. O'Shea—continued.

pose?—It is generally kept at Limerick; or, course, sometimes it is engaged up the Shannon.

110. But that is where it is kept?—Yes.

111. Then one dredger does the whole of the work?—Yes, one dredger does the whole of it.

112. With regard to the dues, where there is a monopoly (as it always comes to), at Kilrush, for example, I suppose the steam company pays exactly the dues which you have handed in?—Yes.

113. And they have got no conditions?—No; the only thing is that there is a second column in the printed table, according to which, vessels pay for any time after the first week, and this steamer, which is calling continuously, is always considered to be in the second week.

114. It actually does get reduced tolls then?—It gets reduced tolls by calling every day compared with what an ordinary steamer would get calling and clearing only once. There is a reduced scale for steamers calling after the first week.

Chairman.

115. What is the meaning of the first week; does it mean the first year?—No, it applies to a vessel staying for a less period than a week.

Mr. O'Shea.

116. The Steam Packet Company, practically, gets a reduction?—But only the same reduction that any other vessel stopping more than a week would get.

Mr. Keay.

117. Do you mean that they have no special terms or rates?—No, they have not.

Mr. O'Shea.

118. It becomes a special rate, does it not?—It is only the same rate that would apply to any other vessel under the schedule.

Mr. Keay.

119. As they are always there, there can be no such thing as the first week?—Exactly.

Mr. O'Sullivan.

120. You have given us an account of the very bad state in which Foynes Harbour is in at present; have not the Commissioners been receiving whatever tolls that have been received there up to the present time?—Yes.

121. What do you think would be a fair and reasonable thing to do before the Commissioners part with their rights over the harbour?—I do not think I understood the question.

122. You say that it is in unfit state at present to work it; it is filled up below low-water mark, and I want to know what you propose to do as a fair regard, on the part of the Commissioners, before they hand it over to anybody, no matter who it is, to put it in a state of repair; would it be fair to put it into the hands of anybody without putting it in a proper state of repair, as it was when the Commissioners first took charge of it?—I think, exclusive of dredging, it pays for itself; it is this abnormal dredging that will always occur there now.

123. Bearing in mind that the Commissioners have

28 April 1885.]

Mr. GREEN.

[Continued.]

Mr. O'Sullivan—continued.

have it in their possession now, and that they are trying to get rid of it, and that it is in a bad state, would it be right of the Commissioners to put it in a good state; seeing that it is their neglect I think, in some way, that it is in its present bad state; do you think that it would be fair for the Committee to recommend that the Commissioners should put it in repair before anybody got it?—I do not think so. I think it will be always liable to slip up.

124. That will be an enormous burden on the people, whoever they may be, upon whom it falls; but before you ask them to take it up from the Commissioners, would it not be well for the Commissioners to put it into proper working order as they got it when they first started; seeing that they have allowed it, from neglect, to get into this bad order, would it be right to ask anybody to take it over before they put it into working order?—I think that is a question to which I can scarcely give an answer.

125. What do you think would be the probable cost of putting it into working order, such as it was originally; I mean generally?—To dredge it again would cost (I am merely giving a rough estimate) from 1,500*l.* to 2,000*l.*, and that, from past experience, would soon be as bad again.

126. You would let the authorities who take it up see to that?—That may be. I may state that the pier is in working order; it is merely that vessels cannot come in at low water to the inner harbour; they remain out at the floating stage.

127. Would it be safe for them to remain there; would they not go over on their side if they remained next the landing; would they not topple over?—I think not.

Mr. Corry.

128. Is it not a fact that there are a great many harbours, and large harbours even, where at low water the ships lie aground?—There are a great number, certainly.

129. And they take no harm whatever?—They take no harm whatever, except when the bottom is rock, and Poynes is particularly suitable; it is as soft as it can be.

130. You say it would cost 1,500*l.* to dredge this existing harbour; but you suggest, or it has been suggested in 1881 that a timber jetty should be thrown out, from the present pier-head, I presume?—Yes.

131. And that would involve a cost of 2,500*l.* or 5,000*l.*, according to the plans?—I may state in explanation of that more fully that the difference in the estimates is due to this; in each case there was a timber jetty running out for some distance from the pier; but in one case it was 150 feet long, and in the other 300 feet, slightly curtailing the accommodation in one case; also there was a difference as to whether iron piles should be brought up to low-water neap tides, the lower estimate being for the shorter jetty of 150 feet long, with entirely timber piles, and the larger one being for the jetty, 300 feet long, with iron piles up to low-water neaps. There have been intermediate estimates also, if you think it necessary that I should state them.

132. Is there any worm there to destroy the

Mr. Corry—continued.

timber?—Not to any serious extent; but even in that case bringing up those iron piles in the larger estimate would entirely obviate it.

133. If you cross the timber, you entirely prevent the worm from taking effect?—I do not think that crosscutting the timber would prevent the worm.

134. It does elsewhere, I know?—I have known worms eat crosscut timber.

135. Provided that you run out this timber jetty, it would entirely obviate the necessity for dredging, would it not?—It would.

136. So that it would be a very much cheaper job for the harbour people to run out this jetty, and to have nothing to do with the dredging?—It would, certainly.

137. What kind of dredgers do you use?—The ordinary bucket dredgers.

138. Would it not be a very much less expensive way of doing it with Priestman's grab-dredger?—A portion of it was done with Priestman's grab-dredgers.

139. Would it not be much less expensive to do it with machinery of that kind?—I do not think it would make very much difference.

140. With reference to those small harbours, where the expenditure exceeds the income so much, how does that arise; what is the cost of maintenance in the cases of those piers?—I think that the fact of the expenditure in the case of the small piers exceeding the income arises from the general apportionment. As I have already said, the expenditure was kept on the whole, and a certain amount apportioned to cover the general expenses.

Mr. O'Shea.

141. Has any particular portion been taken, or is it haphazard?—A regular apportionment is taken every year.

142. A percentage?—No, a certain amount for each pier; 7*l.* 10*s.* for one pier; 5*l.* for another, and so on.

Chairman.

143. Is the same proportion taken each year?—Yes.

Mr. Corry.

144. Does Kilrush silt up also?—There is just a slight accumulation there; you can scarcely call it silting.

145. Does silting take place at Clare Castle?—No; the old Clare Castle Pier is on rock and hard ground. There is rather a rapid in front of it. That was the object of building the new quay a little lower down.

146. When the new quay is finished, do you expect that any dredging will be required there?—Yes, in order to enable vessels to come alongside at low water.

147. Have the foundations been put sufficiently low to enable them to dredge?—The foundation goes down to the rock where the rock appears on the surface, and to large boulders and gravel where it does not; by the use of a coffer excavation we can now actually ascertain the nature of the foundation.

148. And it is placed on rock and hard gravel?—Yes.

149. You

28 April 1885.]

Mr. GREEN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Kemp.

149. You mean the foundation of the new works, I suppose?—Yes, of the new works.

150. The old portion of the new quay does not go down to the rock, does it?—The old portion of the new quay was founded on piles that were driven down to the rock, but a coffer-dam where we could actually excavate was not used.

Mr. Cury.

151. Are you using Portland cement?—Portland cement concrete.

152. Do you expect that when the new quay at Clare Castle is finished, it will give sufficient accommodation for all the trade that seems to be there?—Yes.

153. And you do not anticipate that it will silt up?—I do not think it will silt up.

154. I presume that there must have been some shifting sand or something of that kind when you had to drive in sheet piles?—So far as we can ascertain now, there was a land spring distinctly visible when first the sheet pile-dam was excavated between the surface of the hard ground and the mud, that could not have been foreseen, and when it once starts slipping it is very difficult to stop it.

155. Do you think that now you have overcome it?—Since the sheet piles have been put in in front, there has been no perceptible movement, and in addition to that we shall have the weight of the concrete buttresses in front of it.

Mr. Syman.

156. You state that the original intention with respect to Foynes Harbour was that it should be a harbour 10 feet below low-water mark?—That was the original plan.

157. And the Board of Works made it upon that plan?—They did.

158. And it has totally failed; instead of being 10 feet below low-water mark it is 8 feet above low-water mark?—It has silted up since, and at the extreme land end it is 8 feet above low-water mark.

159. And for the purpose of placing it below low-water mark you must either be continually dredging, or you must go to the additional expense of erecting a pier to carry it out into the river, at a cost of between 2,000 £ and 3,000 £; is not that so?—Yes.

160. How often have you dredged before the year 1884, when you say the dredging cost 1,174 £?—That was in 1881 and 1882. There was one other period when it was dredged at a cost, I believe, of 536 £; that was in 1880 and in 1881.

161. The ordinary receipts of Foynes Harbour are only equal to meet the ordinary expenditure, are they?—That is so.

162. And therefore this continual dredging, which in the course of two years amounted to 1,174 £, would be extra work, would it not?—I think there is a little misapprehension; it has only amounted to about 1,700 £ in the 40 years since the pier has been erected.

163. In 1881 and 1882 it was 1,174 £?—Yes.

164. But for the 11 years it was 8 feet over low-water mark, and you allowed it to remain so?—I do not think I stated that.

165. How long did it require dredging before 0.89.

Mr. Syman—continued.

you dredged it?—It has been gradually accumulating; I could not fix a date.

166. In how many years does it accumulate to such an extent so as to rise above low-water mark?—I am afraid that I cannot answer that question satisfactorily.

Chairman.

167. You say that it was dredged in 1881 and 1882 at a cost of 1,100 £; did that dredging give you deep water at low-water?—No, it did not; it gave a depth of some 5 or 8 feet only at low water; it was not dredged out then to the 10 feet again. I do not know whether I accidentally conveyed a wrong impression.

Mr. Syman.

168. Can you give us an idea of how many years it takes to silt up above low-water mark, so as to render the harbour substantially useless for the purpose of a harbour; could you not tell us how many years it would take the new local authority, upon whom you wish to throw this harbour, to dredge it; how often must they dredge it to keep it even at low water, or 3 or 4 feet above low water?—Every five or six years.

169. When you dredged it last did you dredge nearly at the mouth of the river where you proposed to erect this pier?—There was some dredging inside the harbour.

170. And did it go out nearly to the river?—Yes.

171. And after that did it silt up nearly to the river channel?—It silted up inside the harbour, but not in the portion outside.

172. Did any of it silt up outside the harbour?—I think not.

173. Are you sure?—Yes.

Mr. Lea.

174. Has it ever silted up outside the harbour?—I think not; there may be some slight variation, but not to any serious extent.

Mr. Syman.

175. Has it silted up at all at the pier head since you dredged it last; I am not speaking of the harbour at all, but of the pier head?—I do not think so to any appreciable extent.

176. You think then that it did to some extent; have you measured it, or taken soundings in it?—I have not.

177. Then you cannot answer the question?—No.

178. And therefore you cannot give us an estimate of what it would cost extra to the authority to whom you wish to transfer this harbour, beyond the annual receipts, to keep it in working order?—I can only state that it has cost about 1,700 £ for dredging since the pier was originally completed.

179. Mr. Manning is the engineer to your Board, is he not?—Yes.

180. Have you seen his report with respect to this harbour?—Do you refer to a recent report?

181. It is rather recent; it is some five or six years ago?—I cannot say just at the present moment

28 April 1885.]

Mr. GREEN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Sykes—continued.

moment that I recollect it; but I have no doubt that I have seen it.

182. You cannot refresh your memory now as to his estimate of what it will cost to put it in permanent order?—I believe his estimate was 1,500 *l.* for dredging, which I stated would not be permanent.

183. According to his report what would be the annual expenditure?—I am not aware that he made a statement as to annual expenditure.

184. How long would the 1,500 *l.* cover expenses; can you tell us, according to his report?—I cannot, because it is a matter of degree. I cannot state definitely the number of years.

185. Can you state the facts be reported if your memory is refreshed; how many years did he report that the 1,500 *l.* would cover?—I do not recollect.

186. I merely put those questions to bring you to this point; that to whatever local authority you transfer this harbour, must be, at all events, a substantial body able to bear an additional expense; is not that so?—Yes.

187. If you transferred it to a local sanitary authority, the local sanitary authority would refuse to accept it upon those terms, would they not, if they had any sense?—They might do so.

188. Do you think that the county grand jury even would accept a *dans une heredité* like this, at such an outrageous expenditure?—I think, as a rule, local authorities generally wish to do so.

189. Are you aware that the grand jury of the county of Limerick passed a resolution at the last grand jury sitting with respect to this Foynes Harbour?—I am not.

190. Then it is no use asking you any questions upon that. Supposing they passed a resolution stating that it would be against the interests of the county to accept the transfer upon your terms, would you think they were sensible men?—I do not think it is proposed to transfer it to the county.

191. To whom do you propose to transfer it?—I think that is a question to be settled hereafter.

192. The grand jury of the county repudiate taking it upon the present terms, unless the Board of Works do something to save them from future expenditure. At all events, I ask you this: ought not the authority to which it will be transferred to have the power of accepting or refusing; do you understand that?—I understand what you mean; I think so.

193. And ought not the authority who would get it to be a body interested in the navigation of the River Shannon; ought not such a body to be a proper authority?—It should be an authority interested in the navigation of the River Shannon, or interested in the locality generally.

194. The Limerick Harbour Board, I believe you will admit, is the authority that has the navigation of that part of the River Shannon in its charge?—Yes, I believe so; at the same time I am not aware that they have any exclusive right to that.

195. They have the charge of all the shipping; are you aware of that?—Yes.

196. They have the charge of laying down all the moys on the river, and taking care to see

Mr. Sykes—continued.

that there are no rocks to interfere with the navigation of the river as far down as Foynes, at all events?—Yes; but they do not exercise it in the districts that are under the board's jurisdiction.

197. Quite so; and if this district under the board's jurisdiction was transferred to that authority, that would be an authority interested in the navigation of the River Shannon, would it not?—Yes.

198. The Limerick Harbour authority, that is to say?—I cannot say whether it would be the Limerick Harbour authority to whom they would transfer it.

199. But suppose it were; I am asking you this: if the Limerick Harbour authority offered to accept the charge of this harbour, without any conditions from the Board of Works, or without compelling the Board of Works to expend any additional money, do you think they ought to get the transfer; at all events, whatever authority gets it, ought it to be an authority that will accept it voluntarily, and be able to bear an additional expense?—As I understand that, by the Bill it cannot be transferred to them unless they are willing.

200. Not if they repudiate it; but the Bill does not provide that they shall propose to accept it. You do not propose, I take it, that if you got any authority willing to accept it, which it is not competent to carry it out, you will get rid of your liability by throwing it upon an authority that would leave it in its present condition?—I think the authority should be an authority approved of by the Board of Works, or by the Treasury, or both.

201. And by Parliament?—Yes.

202. The dealing would be a dealing between the Board of Works and the authority; is it not possible that the Board of Works may deal with an authority that may be incompetent to carry out what is necessary, and to bear this additional expenditure?—I do not think the Board would do so.

203. Is it not possible?—I think not.

204. Do not you think that the Board of Works is anxious to get rid of this additional expenditure?—I think not, unless they could transfer it to a body that would maintain it. There are provisions in the Bill for proper maintenance, and if it is not properly maintained the Board may step in and execute the works of maintenance themselves, as they do in the case of fishery piers at present.

205. No doubt the Bill provides that if they do not do it measures may be taken, under the Treasury, to take it out of their hands, and to put it in proper order?—Yes.

206. For how many years was Foynes Harbour allowed to remain in its insufficient condition silted up 8 feet above low water, and totally useless as a harbour; and that all the time being under the management of the Board of Works?—The 8 feet only refers to the land end of the pier; and I do not think there are five of the present piers all round the coast of Ireland where the ground is not 8 feet above low water at the land end.

207. At

28 April 1885.]

MR. GREEN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Synan—continued.

207. At the entrance into the harbour?—No; the land end.

208. I am talking of the mouth of the harbour, the entrance from the river?—That is not 8 feet above low water.

209. How much is it?—The low-water strips some few feet just outside; I should say it is at the pier head only about 1 to 2 feet above low water.

210. At this moment?—Yes.

211. After year dredging in 1881 and 1882?—Yes.

212. Before your dredging in 1881 and 1882, how many feet was it above low water?—At the harbour mouth very little more than it is now; but it is some 4 or 5 feet above low water inside the harbour further in.

213. How far in?—One hundred feet probably.

214. What is the breadth of the harbour altogether?—The average breadth is about 300 feet; but you would never dredge the whole of that width.

215. How far is it dredged?—The width of entrance is considerably less than that; about 180 feet in round numbers; and that was dredged.

216. How far in was it dredged?—About half the length.

217. One hundred and fifty feet would that be?—Yes.

218. That is half the 300 feet?—The 300 feet is the breadth; you asked me the breadth, not the length.

219. What is the length?—Three hundred and fifty feet.

220. And for half of that length it was dredged?—Rather more than half I should say; about two-thirds.

221. And 100 feet of that two-thirds was 4 or 5 feet above low water when you began to dredge in 1881 and 1882?—Yes.

222. And you only reduce it to 1 or 2 feet above low-water mark?—No; I did not convey that.

223. It is about 1 or 2 feet above low water at the present moment?—Yes.

224. After you dredged it two years ago, that is to say?—It is between three or four years ago.

225. You said in 1882?—In 1881 and 1882; the inside dredging was done in 1881, that is four years ago.

226. When was the outside dredging done?—In 1882.

Chairman.

227. Have you had many complaints made by the Board of Works about the state of this pier, that is to say, about the want of dredging or about the works?—They have not come under my notice if there have been complaints.

Mr. Ewart.

228. What is the rise of the tide at Foynes?—The spring tide rises about 16 feet 3 inches, and with the neap tides the actual rise and fall is only about 7 feet 10 inches; but the low water at neaps is not so low as low-water springs. I do not know whether I make myself quite clear.

Q.89.

Mr. Ewart—continued.

The spring range will be 16 feet 3 inches, and the neap range will be about 7 feet 10 inches.

229. What would the datum line be about?—The datum line for that is about low-water springs; but that is not the datum line from which we take the neap rise. There is a difference between neap rise and neap range; the neap rise is the rise of high-water neaps above low water of springs, and the neap range is the difference between high and low water at neaps.

230. What is the tonnage of the largest vessel that does go in?—About 300 tons.

231. And what would the draught be about?—Probably 13 feet.

232. It can only enter at high water?—They can only enter at three-quarter tide in the inner harbour, that is the basin.

233. You spoke of running out a pier; would that do away with dredging altogether?—It would obviate the necessity for dredging, because the vessels that draw more water could lie at the timber jetty.

234. Would the pier you spoke of supply the accommodation for all the traffic?—I think so.

Mr. Synan.

235. Will you please look at that map and show us where the projecting pier is to be which you recommend?—What was proposed at that time would be something of this description (*describing it on the Map*).

Mr. Ewart.

236. It would be a very small thing, would it not?—Two hundred feet in length. Will you allow me to put it on to scale. (*The Witness marked it on the Plan*.)

Mr. Synan.

237. If it is only to be a place of call, and the harbour silts up and is not dredged, it will be useless as a harbour?—Vessels could always come in.

238. They could come in at high water and be stranded?—Yes.

239. There would only be a draught at high water, and that a very small draught?—Yes.

Mr. Cury.

240. Is not Dover a case of the same kind?—I am not aware that the case of Dover is similar.

241. I knew that it is so at Harwich, and all round the coast?—It is very likely.

Chairman.

242. I suppose if this harbour were transferred to a proper authority they might have dredging going on continuously, for keeping the place in a proper state?—They might, of course.

243. Assuming that they had a dredger, of course?—Yes.

Mr. Kenny.

244. Are those your plans you have before you?—Yes.

245. Will you let me see them a minute if you please?—Yes (*Handing the Plans to the honourable Member*).

n 2

246. How

28 April 1885.]

Mr. GREEN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Kenny—continued.

246. How many feet would you say Foynes Harbour silts up every year; could you make a rough guess?—I am afraid I could not.

247. Where is the silting worst?—At the centre of the harbour; about here (pointing it out).

248. Could you make a rough guess as to how much it silts up every year there?—You have put the question in a difficult way to answer. If a portion of the harbour is dredged, the silting in the deep portion will be much more rapid than in any other portion; therefore, the way you have put the question is a way I could scarcely answer.

249. It would vary according to the accumulation, and get less every year?—The portion which has recently been dredged, and is deeper, is the portion that receives the deposit.

250. So that the more thoroughly it is dredged the more necessary it will be to continue dredging it?—No, I do not think that follows.

251. You say that it accumulates more rapidly when it is thoroughly dredged?—I say that if one portion is dredged deeper than another, that part would silt up level with the other; it always has a tendency to silt up level with the adjacent part.

252. Then it will be necessary to dredge it more frequently when it is dredged far down; when it is brought down to the original level of 10 feet deep at low water; was not that the original plan?—It was. I do not think there is anything to warrant me in saying that it would require to be dredged more frequently.

253. You say that vessels of only 300 tons can come into the harbour?—At the present time; there were vessels of 300 tons in when I was there.

254. Could larger vessels come into the inner harbour?—They could at three-quarter tide.

255. What would be the largest sized vessel that could come into the harbour?—I suppose 300 tons.

256. What size vessel could now discharge, in the event of this suggested improvement of yours being carried out, outside the harbour?—I think a vessel of 300 tons could have discharged there if that had been carried out.

Mr. Synn.

257. At the pier?—At the proposed jetty.

Mr. Kenny.

258. Vessels of 300 tons could discharge at the proposed jetty, you say?—Yes.

259. What sized vessel can discharge at Limerick Harbour?—I am scarcely prepared to say, but it would be vessels of a much larger size than that.

260. You know that 2,000-ton vessels can discharge there?—I am not aware that they can at low water.

261. You know that vessels of 2,000 tons at least, can come into the Limerick Harbour at the present time?—Yes.

262. And discharge at the docks?—I should think so.

263. Are you aware that the Limerick Har-

Mr. Kenny—continued.

bour Board want to get the control over Foynes Harbour?—I do not know whether they made the proposal or not; I am aware that there is some idea of it, but whether it came from them I cannot say.

264. Do the passenger steamers that go up the Shannon belonging to the Shannon Steamboat Company pay rates and harbour dues at each harbour they call at?—They do, so far as the Board's piers are concerned; I have no means of telling the particulars with regard to the others.

265. But they pay a reduced rate on that; it would be unfair to charge them at each place of call the same rate, (seeing that they call six times a week perhaps), as you charge a vessel calling once in six months, an ocean-going vessel?—That is one of the reasons why there is a second column to the schedule of tolls, in which you see that the second week is only about one-half of the first.

266. As a matter of fact, these passenger vessels carry goods and cattle?—Yes; and the goods and cattle are charged if they are unloaded, not if they are not.

267. You say that the Shannon Navigation Trust have no dredge?—Yes.

268. How much does it cost to bring that dredge from Limerick to Foynes?—I suppose with the towage of the dredger, and the towage of the necessary barges to discharge the spoil, it would be from 25 £. to 30 £.

269. How much would it cost to take the same dredge to Kilrush?—That would be a little in excess, but the slight difference in distance would make very little difference, if any.

270. In the event of the piers and harbour being transferred to local bodies, the dredging will continue to be necessary; and do not you think that the expense of dredging will be increased by reason of the fact that the local harbour would not have dredgers of their own?—It will be slightly increased, of course.

271. And that system would lead to an additional expenditure, would it not?—It would.

272. With regard to the transfer of these piers to the local authorities, I suppose you are aware that a number of local authorities would be authorities who could compete for the management of any pier under the Bill?—They might do so.

273. I understood the honourable Member for the county Limerick to say that they could not make proposals, but they are not prevented by the Bill; that is what I want to bring out?—No.

Mr. Synn.

274. But they are not bound to do so by the Bill?—No.

Mr. Kenny.

275. I want to ask you a question about Kilrush; there is a railway connecting Foynes with Limerick, is there not?—Yes.

276. That is an important consideration connected with the development of Foynes, is it not?—Yes.

277. And, as a matter of fact, are you not aware

28 April 1885.]

Mr. GREEN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Kenny—continued.

aware that the principal portion of the passenger traffic between Foynes and Kilrush and Kilkee embark at Foynes, going to Foynes from Limerick by the rail?—I suppose a great number do.

278. In the summer season that is nearly invariably the case, is it not?—I could not say whether they go that way, or by the Limerick steamer direct.

279. They go to Foynes, as a rule?—Probably that is the quicker way.

280. You say that at Kilrush there was a proposal in 1880 to extend the pier by 150 feet at a cost of 8,000 £?—Yes.

281. Do you know why that proposal was never carried into effect?—I do not know, except that the Shannon funds are generally overdrawn.

282. Was it proposed to raise this 8,000 £ at the expense of the Kilrush Harbour dues?—I am not aware of that.

283. Could you say how much it has cost for dredging in Kilrush since the construction of the pier in 1841, or since its completion, rather, in 1845?—It was only dredged once, and the amount was rather small, but I am not certain whether I have the exact amount.

284. You said that some dredging was carried on in the year 1861, did you not?—Yes.

285. What was the cost of the dredging in that year?—I find I have not got it here; but it was only a small amount.

286. Only a small amount in 1861, you say. I have some figures here, 2,280 £; I do not know how they got here; it could not have cost as much as that, you think?—No.

287. You repeated some figures, 2,280 £, and I was not quite certain whether they applied to dredging or not?—I may be able to see in one minute; 2,150 £, is it not?

288. £. 2,280 is what I have written down; it may be 2,130 £; perhaps I did not catch it correctly. I am speaking of Kilrush?—I do not appear to have any figure of that amount in respect of Kilrush.

Mr. Synge.

289. But you have with respect to Foynes?—Yes, 2,150 £. to 5,000 £ odd to erect a jetty.

Mr. Kenny.

290. I am speaking of Kilrush; there is a sum with regard to Kilrush of 2,150 £, which the district contributed. With regard to Clare Castle, you say that the design for the works was originally made in 1843?—Yes.

291. And you say that in 1844 the old pier was built; the old quay was completed in 1844, I think you said?—Yes, there was an existing pier before that, which was rebuilt after the new portion was built first, to give accommodation.

292. You say that the present old quay was rebuilt in 1845?—What I mean to imply by that was that there was an existing quay before any works were commenced there at all by the Shannon authorities.

293. There was an old quay before the year 1843?—Yes, an old quay of 140 feet long, and this pier was extended by 380 feet, the arrangement.

Mr. Kenny—continued.

most being that 390 feet should be added before the old pier was interfered with; then the old pier was taken down and rebuilt, after vessels were enabled to go to the other portion which had just recently been constructed; that was finished in 1844, and the pier which existed before was taken down and rebuilt in 1845.

294. Was there any dredging carried on in 1845, or afterwards, in Clare Castle?—The channel was cleared, but whether it was actually dredged or excavated I could not say; it was mostly above low water, and therefore it does not necessarily follow that it was dredged, but rock and clay and gravel were removed to deepen it.

295. With regard to the cost for building Clare Castle Pier, the original cost was 4,184 £ for the old quay?—£. 4,183. 17 s.; that is practically correct.

296. There was a free grant by the Government of 1,394 £?—Yes.

297. Did you receive any communication between the Town Commissioners of Ennis and the late Secretary to the Treasury, Lord Frederick Cavendish, which this so-called grant is spoken of as a loan, and as having been long since repaid?—I have not.

298. You never saw that?—No.

299. At any rate the district you say contributed 2,789 £?—It did.

300. So that the Shannon Navigation Company, that is, the Shannon Trust, never contributed anything towards the building of that old quay?—They contributed the 1,394 £.

301. Was that received from the Government, from the Treasury?—I would take it that the Shannon Trust and the Treasury were synonymous, practically.

302. Do you mean that the Shannon Trust and the Consolidated Fund were the same; did not the 1,394 £ come out of the Consolidated Fund?—I presume so.

303. Then it certainly did not come out of the revenues of the Shannon Trust?—The Shannon Trust have no revenues to start with.

304. Of course they had credit to start with, which was nearly equivalent, I suppose. At any rate, this 1,394 £, you say, was a free grant?—Yes.

305. Now, the revenues of Clare Castle between the year 1844, we will say, and the end of the year 1884, according to your own statement, was over 4,000 £?—£. 4,371 £.

306. And the expenditure in that time was 2,340 £?—Yes.

307. That shows that the Harbour Trust had already a net profit of over 2,000 £, in fact 2,500 £. out of the Clare Castle Quay?—Yes, about that; I think it was estimated at 2,417 £.

308. In the year 1879, or the year 1880, it was proposed to erect a new quay?—It was.

309. And that proposal was carried out?—Yes.

310. The original estimate was how much?—The original estimate was 2,000 £.

311. By what means was the estimate increased to 5,000 £?—The estimate was increased to 5,000 £ on account of the works being carried on to give as much work as possible during the winter when

28 April 1885.]

Mr. GREEN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Kenny—continued.

a serious landslip occurred; and the ground having once slipped, it became very much more troublesome to construct the quay than if it had never slipped.

312. I believe the original design for the new quay was for a wooden construction, was it not?—I do not know what you refer to by the original design; the design that was carried out was never, so far as I know, proposed to be a timber structure.

313. Did you ever see the Report of General Sankey which was published on the 28th of last October about Clare Castle?—I may have seen the report, but I do not call it to mind.

314. Do you remember such a passage as this occurring in it: "In the observance of strict economy the chief engineer's first design was simply for a framed timber jetty"?—There may have been an estimate made for a framed jetty.

315. Would the estimate of 2,000*l.* be to cover a framed timber jetty?—The estimate of 2,000*l.* was for a masonry pier as it has been actually commenced, but it would have made a timber jetty.

316. You say that a landslip occurred after the jetty was constructed, of concrete?—Concrete resting on piles; the landslip occurred while the foundations were being taken out before the construction; it occurred during construction in fact.

317. You have examined Clare Castle Pier yourself, have you not?—I have.

318. How long is it since you examined it?—About 10 days ago.

319. And is the place of the landslip at present to be seen, or is it covered over again?—I do not think the landslip is apparent; where the pier sank from the effect is apparent, but not the original landslip.

320. General Sankey is a distinguished engineer, is he not?—Yes, he is.

321. Could you tell me what General Sankey, after a personal inspection of the pier, could have meant by saying, "The operations up to the virtual completion of the work of the quay wall were it is understood conducted with perfect success." What does he mean by saying "it is understood;" could he not assure himself, could not an engineer assure himself of the fact by instituting full inquiries?—I do not know what he could mean by that phrase, unless he means that so far as was apparent there was no injury to it.

322. Was he not aware that a great number of complaints were sent to the Board of Works about the manner in which the works were being conducted; you say that a landslip occurred?—It did.

323. Are you certain of that?—I am certain of it; in fact, it was very providential that the men at work were not killed at the time it occurred.

324. You refer to the landslip?—Yes.

325. Was it a sudden or a gradual movement; you seem to think it was a sudden movement?—It was a sudden movement.

326. Was any reason given for that sudden movement?—I do not quite gather who you mean would give the reason.

Mr. Kenny—continued.

327. The superintending engineer?—I do not know whether a reason was given, but the reason probably was the extreme wet weather; it was winter time; it was the end of November.

Chairman.

328. In what year; do you remember?—1880 or 1881, I forget which; October 1880.

Mr. Kenny.

329. Could there be any other reason for a landslip at that place?—I think not, with the exception of local springs; I mean under the silt.

330. Is not the country just round there very level?—It is very level.

331. It is not naturally a place where a landslip would be likely to occur, is it?—My own experience would rather be that landslips often do occur on the sloping shore of a river, especially when interfered with, when excavations are made in them.

332. The bottom of the river is rock, is it not; we will say 15 feet below the bed of the river?—It is rock in some places, and in others gravel and boulders.

333. But if you go down a sufficient depth you come to rock?—Yes, or a hard bottom.

334. Which could not possibly give way; but instead of going down and constructing the foundations of the new pier on that hard rock, you preferred to drive down wooden piles?—Yes, it was constructed on wooden piles instead of going down to the rock.

335. Have these wooden piles been examined since?—I think it would be impossible to examine them.

336. At any rate in the general movement forward of the new pier from what you call a landslip, those wooden piles would also have been carried along?—Yes, probably so.

337. And the landslip represents a movement of the whole structure including the piles from the rocky foundation at the bottom?—Yes.

338. If the foundation of the pier had originally been carried down 15 feet further, there would have been no such thing as a movement; do you think a landslip is likely to have occurred since?—Not unless a landslip occurred during the time the foundations were being put in: it would have been perfectly secure probably if they had been carried down to the rock in the first instance, but I may state that the landslip did occur while the foundations were being excavated.

339. Do not you think the landslip might be caused by the great weight of the concrete structure placed on the wooden piles?—The landslip occurred before ever the concrete was there.

340. Before there was a stone structure?—Yes.

341. Was the stone structure sufficiently heavy of itself to cause the wooden foundations easily to slip forward?—No, because the pressure would be vertical; the pressure from the masonry or concrete would be vertically on the top of the piles; there would be no tendency from the weight of the structure to go forward; in fact, it would

28 April 1885.]

Mr. GREEN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Kenny—continued.

would be an important element to prevent the landslip from pushing it forward.

342. Supposing the wharf or the quay was piled with any timber, or any other material, would it not have an additional effect?—Yes, the greater amount of weight put on the back, of course, would have no additional effect.

343. Of course the pressure would be vertical, provided the foundation was perfectly level?—The pressure from the masonry would be vertical, provided the foundation was perfectly level.

344. But if the rocks sloped onwards where the piles touched the foundation then they might slip, and the structure give way?—The weight of the structure would not have that tendency.

345. Would it not have a tendency to press out the wooden piles if the wooden piles were placed on an oblique surface?—No.

346. Are you perfectly certain of that?—I am.

347. At any rate one thing is clear, that if the stone foundation had been carried down to the original rock, no pressure of earth behind it would have been sufficient to have moved it forward into the river?—It would have been very improbable.

348. I did not clearly understand from you how it was that the original estimate was increased from 2,000 £ to 5,000 £ odd?—After the structure showed signs of movement the works were suspended for a short time, and some of the filling removed to prevent the lateral pressure from pushing it forward; and then, afterwards, as a greater security, as a greater safeguard, relieving arches were built at the back to try and prevent the pressure from having any effect on the whole structure.

349. Now you say that the pressure of earth must necessarily have been the sole reason; that the whole structure was projected into the river as it moved forward?—Yes, the pressure of earth which was increased probably by a land spring.

350. After you relieved the structure by those arches, was there any subsequent movement?—Yes, there was.

351. What produced it?—The arches do not entirely relieve the pressure, they reduce it.

352. Do you know whether General Sankey said in his report that the arches would have been quite sufficient to relieve the structure?—I am not aware whether he stated it or not; but the arches would have been quite sufficient if no slip had ever occurred. I may state that when a slip has once occurred it is a great deal more difficult to arrest a slip than it would be to sustain the pressure of earth in the first instance.

353. What do you think would have been the additional cost of carrying the foundations down to the solid rock at first?—It is almost impossible to give you any reliable figures at a moment's notice, but it would have been something very considerable; there is not only the additional masonry, but the expense of entirely piling round it to excavate, and excavation below low water might cost a great deal more than the masonry.

354. These would be considerations in the estimate; you cannot give a very reliable estimate.

Mr. Kenny—continued.

mate?—I cannot say off-hand; it would be scarcely fair for me to state at a minute's notice.

355. I would not like to bind you down to an exact sum, but if you could give an approximate estimate; if you came within 300 £ or 400 £, that would be quite near enough for my purpose?—I think it would have cost between 2,000 £ and 3,000 £ more, certainly.

Mr. Corry.

356. Is it not an everyday occurrence to see piers being built upon piles?—It is.

Mr. Kenny.

357. I want to come to this point; there was application made to the Board of Works to dredge the river, was there not in front of this new pier?—There might have been, but it was always the intention to take this away. I am not aware whether there was any special application for it.

358. General Sankey in his report says, "Several representations not long after this reached the Board"; that would be sometime in 1882 or 1883. "Several representations not long after this reached the Board from persons engaged in the trade, that the available depth of water close in front of the quay wall was insufficient to allow of their vessels discharging satisfactorily, and requesting that dredging should be carried out." He says also, "This demand called for consideration, as however successful the remedial measures had proved in regard to the movement above adverted to, it was thought undesirable to excite to any great extent in front, and thus possibly alter in any material way the general conditions of stability." Do not you think that consideration ought to have been paid when this pier was constructed on wooden piles to the danger that might afterwards result from dredging in front of it?—Yes.

359. This paragraph, which I have just quoted from General Sankey's report, necessarily means that any pier constructed on wooden piles is not so safe a structure as one in which the foundations go down to the rock, in which the foundations are of mason work?—There would be more risk on a pier constructed on piles after this slip had occurred, and it would not be judicious then to interfere with the work in front.

360. And that consideration to which I have referred ought to have been additionally before the mind of the engineer of the works at a place where dredging was permanently essential?—Yes.

361. General Sankey goes on to say this: "Looking, however, to the success of the measures which had been adopted" (that is, the measures for repairing the work), "and recognising the reasonableness of the demand for accommodating any and all vessels which could find their way up the river, it was decided, though not without some hesitation, to meet the request which had been preferred, and the necessary excavation was carried by order of the Board, in June 1884;" could you tell me whether in engineering technique the term "excavation" and

28 April 1885.]

Mr. GREEN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Kenny—continued.

and "dredging" are synonymous; are they equivalent?—Not always, dredging would imply removing material under low water, and excavation would generally mean removing material above low water; at the same time, dredging is excavation.

362. You know that the bed of the River Fergus is opposite this new pier?—Yes, I do.

363. It is rather muddy, is it not?—Yes.

364. Nearly all mud, is it not?—Yes.

365. And dredging would mean there the removal of mud?—Yes.

366. And the term dredging is applied to the removal of mud, while the term excavation is applied to the removal of gravel and stone?—I think not; the term dredging is applied to anything that has to be removed by a dredger below water.

367. But the removal of mud from the bed of a river in front of this pier would be less likely to affect its stability than the removal of stone or gravel; is not that a fact; has mud so great a supporting power?—No; mud has not so great a supporting power; but, on the other hand, the fact of dredging mud in front implies mud at the back, which has considerably more pressure than hard material to injure the pier.

368. But the foundations of the whole thing are perhaps rather muddy; you say that the excavation, as General Sankey calls it, the dredging, as the local authority calls it, occurred in 1884; are you aware when the next slip occurred in the work?—Shortly after that; I could not say exactly when.

369. General Sankey says it was early in September. I suppose you accept that statement?—Yes.

370. "Early in September, information reached the Board," he says, "that a further movement or settlement of the work had again shown itself, and investigations were at once initiated, which concluded with the personal inspection of the quay by the chief engineer." That is Mr. Manning, is it not?—Yes.

371. "On the 17th of September, and following days." As a result of that, Mr. Manning prepared two plans, did he not?—Yes.

372. For the renewal of those works, and the repair of the works?—Yes.

373. Have you had those two plans before you?—I have.

374. What was the estimated cost of the first of them; about £,500 L, was it not?—Yes, one was 500 L or 600 L in excess of the other.

375. Can you tell me how far into the river has this work projected; has it moved since the time that the first land-slip occurred?—Since the very beginning, do you mean?

376. Yes?—Some six to seven feet at one end, but considerably less at the other; two feet, probably.

377. None of the bed of the river is six to seven feet, is it?—Yes.

378. Are you aware that the first plan which Mr. Manning prepared proposed to narrow the bed of the river by 18 feet further?—About that; 16 feet to 18 feet; I could not say exactly. No, it would not narrow it quite as much as that.

379. For instance, what General Sankey says

Mr. Kenny—continued.

of Mr. Manning's plan is this: "Mr. Manning has since forwarded his detailed designs (two in number) and estimates for the restoration works which he considers necessary, one being for a continuous front wall, independent of and having a face 18 feet in advance of the present quay." If it had a face 18 feet in advance of the present quay it must necessarily have narrowed the bed of the river by 18 feet, must it not?—The 18 feet is at the top, at the bottom it would be somewhat less on account of the batter of the existing wall.

380. "The other, providing for an arrangement of concrete piers, at intervals of 12 feet along the entire front, with timber platform above, cost estimated at 1,750 L," was not that so?—Yes.

381. How much would that second scheme narrow the bed of the river?—Practically the same.

382. There was to be a timber platform above; do not you think now that narrowing the bed of the river at that particular place would injure the navigation on the river?—I should like to look at the plan of the river there, if you please. (*The Witness referred to the Plan.*) The width of the river is nearly 100 yards at that place.

383. But how wide is the bed of the river where it is possible for a ship to get up at that place; that is what I want to know?—At low water probably it is 100 feet.

384. Do you think that a vessel could get up there at low water, within 100 feet, at a width of 100 feet?—With a width of 100 feet channel the water is about 5 or 6 feet deep at low water, which is not sufficient for all vessels to get up.

385. They are stranded there in about 2 feet of water at low water?—At the old quay?

386. Yes?—No; the old quay at low water has only the river water in it.

387. That is about 2 feet, is it not?—It is a rapid.

388. There is no tidal water?—No.

389. So that virtually, as a matter of fact, it is dry. How much water do they have at the bottom of the lower quay, the new quay?—At the pool opposite, some 5 or 6 feet.

390. What I refer to is this; when a three-quarter tide is in, and vessels usually pass the new quay to get to the old quay, what is the width of the river within the points where vessels could proceed to pass on to the old quay?—At three-quarter tide the river is so spacious that I do not think the fact of the pier projecting 17 or 18 feet would be any material inconvenience; if that is the point you allude to.

391. Do not you know that the river is much deeper towards the centre of the stream than it is near the banks?—The deeper portion is on the other side, and we are rather approaching the deeper portion by putting it 18 feet out.

392. On what side is that?—The railway side. I do not know which point of the compass it is.

393. It would be the eastern banks of the river; are you quite sure of that point that the deep portion is towards the eastern bank of the river?—Yes.

394. You have sounded the river there, have you?

28 April 1885.]

Mr. GREEN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Kenny—continued.

you?—No; but I have seen sections that have been sounded by an assistant in our Department.

395. How long since?—I speak now of sections taken some two or three years ago; there may have been more recent ones; I am not quite certain upon that point as to whether they have been taken more recently than that.

396. I believe there was a movement throughout the whole of the new pier, was there not, in advance?—Yes, but much more at one end than the other.

397. Fifty feet of that had to be rebuilt, had it not, that is to say, 50 feet of the pier had to be re-constructed, because it was so badly damaged by the movement; is that not a fact?—A portion of it is very badly damaged.

398. At the present time?—At the present time.

399. As a matter of fact, has any portion of the pier been re-constructed that you know of?—I am not certain whether a portion had been re-constructed or not at the time that the arches were built, that is to say, the relieving arches at the back; additions were made then.

400. There has been a movement of the relieving arches, has there not, as well as of the structure?—A portion of one relieving arch has broken, and several others are dislocated.

401. This is in Mr. Manning's report, the chief engineer of the Board of Works. "I visited the work on the 17th of September and following days, when I found that 135 feet out of 200 feet in length of the quay was uninjured; for about 50 feet of the remainder very serious damage had taken place, involving the rebuilding of that part of the work from about the level of low-water spring tides." I am endeavouring to show that this slip had taken place in the work involving partial reconstruction owing to the defective manner in which the plans were originally prepared by the Board of Works; was not that the case?—I think not; I think the slip occurred owing to a landspring.

402. What you think of course is that it was purely an accidental cause?—I do.

403. At any rate it involves an additional expenditure of 2,000 £?—Yes.

404. Making a total expenditure of 7,000 £?—Yes.

405. And this whole amount is raised on the security of the harbour dues of the Clare Castle Pier, is it not?—I am not prepared to state that; I do not think the funds are kept separate for any one pier. As regards the money, it is raised on the security of the Shannon Navigation generally. I do not know that it is on the tolls.

406. At any rate it is on the security of the Shannon Trust?—Yes.

407. And we have already ascertained from you that the Shannon Trust have hitherto received a net profit from the Clare Castle Pier of over 2,000 £?—Yes.

408. Of 2,500 £?—£ 2,417.

409. Over 2,400 £; that is really what I want to get out of you; furthermore, do you know whether the Shannon Trust have taken any measures to secure the proper navigation of the River Fergus; have they placed any buoys or lights on the river?—I think not.

410. Are you aware that they refused to place

0.89.

Mr. Kenny—continued.

a light on a most dangerous rock there three or four years ago, because it involved an expenditure of 20 £ on their part, and 20 £ on the part of the Irish Light Board?—I am not aware of the fact about the light; there was something said about a beacon on the rock.

411. That is the rock called Boorland's Rock?—Yes; but why it was not done I do not know.

412. Are you also aware that the navigation of the River Fergus is at all times rather risky; it is necessary to have a pilot for every vessel that goes up the river, is it not?—I think so; but I do not think that that portion of the River Fergus is under the jurisdiction of the Board of Works.

413. So that in the event of the transfer of this jurisdiction to a local body really interested in the thing, the expenditure for the purpose of keeping it in proper order would naturally be greater than what it is at the present time?—I do not quite gather what you mean.

414. What I mean is this; that the expenditure at the present time by the Shannon Trust on the Clare Castle Pier is not sufficient to secure the most effective and perfect navigation of the River Fergus?—I think it would involve an entirely different question, namely, the improvement of the River Fergus navigation; that would be a very wide question.

415. The improvement of the navigation of the river Fergus is directly involved in the question of the Clare Castle Pier; that is apparent, is it not?—No, I do not think so.

416. To go to another matter: the 7,000 £ that has been raised by the Shannon Trust, on their own security, from the Treasury, is repayable, is it not, in 25 years; and if this harbour were transferred to a local body, and the 7,000 £ thrown upon it, the annual sum in repayment of that loan would be more than 300 £, would it not?—I do not know that it follows that it is to be repaid in 25 years.

417. That is the term of the loan; it is repayable in 25 years for the first 5,000 £; and I assume that it would be the same for the subsequent 2,000 £?—I am not aware what the terms were for the first loan.

418. At any rate, assuming them to be that, as I believe they are, the annual sum repayable to the Treasury would be over 750 £, in fact?—Yes, I suppose it would be that; I cannot say off-hand.

419. The annual revenue of the pier is about 250 £ or 270 £, is it not?—It is rather more than that; it has been 285 £ for the last five years.

420. So that, on my figures, that would involve an annual loss to the new authority, which they would have to make up by some arrangements under the powers in the Bill, assuming them to be made liable for the 7,000 £ expended by the Board of Works?—Yes, assuming them to be liable for the whole of it.

421. And, as the honourable Member for Limerick has already asked you, do you think that if they were wise men they would take over a damnable Acredites like that?—There are the extra receipts which I do not think you have taken into account in what you have credited them with.

C

422. That

28 April 1885.]

Mr. GREEN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Kenny—continued.

422. That is the 2,000 £?—£2,400.

423. Which would become payable to the credit of the new Harbour Board; would it become payable to the new board constituted under this Bill?—Probably a portion of it would, but I am not prepared to state what portion.

424. Do you think the amount actually due would revert to the new authority; is that your opinion?—I do not think the total would.

425. But you think that a portion would?—Yes.

426. What portion do you think?—I do not know whether that is a question about which I am competent to express an opinion; anything I might state would be merely my personal opinion, and not as representing the Board of Works.

Chairman.

427. The figures you gave for the traffic returns at the different piers are for the last year 1884, are they not?—Yes.

428. I just wished to have that made clear. With respect to the expenditure upon Foynes, you gave us 125 £; I presume that is made up exclusive of the actual dredging?—The expenditure for that year is exclusive of the dredging.

429. Can you state how that 125 £ is made up?—£. 26 10s. is paid to the collector. I think 20 £ is the proportion charged to Foynes for general expenditure; the remainder would be for slight repairs; it might be only metalling a wharf. I could not say what the particular items in that year were.

Mr. Kenny.

430. You spoke some time since of repairs being required in several of the harbours, or in three or four them, involving a certain outlay;

Mr. Kenny—continued.

in three, is it proposed to do that at the expense of the Shannon Trust before the transfer of the piers?—I could not say.

Chairman.

431. I should just like to know about this 125 £ for the year 1884; does it include any amount for compensation of any kind?—I think it does. I think 25 £ was paid for compensation; I do not know for the moment whether it was in that year, but I think it was probably in that year, as there was that sum paid for compensation.

432. Can you give the average expenditure for the five years, exclusive of dredging?—The average expenditure for the five years, exclusive of dredging, and of that compensation which I see I have deducted from the five years, and therefore it occurred in the five years, would be 68 £, against the average receipts of 115 £.

Mr. Lee.

433. There is one point which I should like to have made clear with regard to that general expenditure, which you allot to each pier; do you allot it in proportion to the size, or the cost, or the receipts?—No, this was the way the allotment was made. A great many sundry little things were done at the piers that could not be apportioned in any other way, unless a strict account was kept from the commencement how the money was actually expended on each pier.

434. On what proportion is it allotted?—It is an arbitrary sum.

Mr. Kenny.

435. You said at the time it was more or less arbitrary?—Yes, that it was never intended to be kept separate for the different piers.

Friday, 1st May 1865.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Corry.
Mr. Ewart.
Mr. Hibbert.
Mr. Kenney.

Mr. Thomas Lee.
Mr. O'Shea.
Mr. O'Sullivan.
Mr. Syann.

JOHN T. HIBBERT, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. HENRY BRADSHAW HARRIS, called in; and Examined.

Mr. Kenney.

Mr. Kenney—continued.

436. YOU are manager for Messrs. Bannatyne and Sons, of Rinal and Limerick?—I am.

437. They are corn millers in Limerick, are they not?—Yes, and extensive merchants also.

438. Their works are on a very large scale, I believe?—Yes.

439. They bring a good deal of corn by vessel up to Clare Castle, do they not?—Yes.

440. And therefore you are directly interested in the state of Clare Castle Pier?—Yes.

441. You employ vessels of your own, do you not?—Yes, we have one steamer exclusively for the purpose.

442. But you sometimes have to employ other vessels as well, do you not?—Yes.

443. Do you find that the condition of Clare Castle Pier is such as to act as a deterrent to captains of vessels and owners chartering with you to convey your corn to Rinal?—Yes, and for other reasons; merchants have told me that they refuse to come to the Port of Clare in consequence of obstructions in the river, and owing to the difficulty of getting berths when they come to Clare.

Mr. Syann.

444. What is the character of the obstructions, is it the pier itself?—The obstructions are in the river, and the impediments are at the quay of Clare.

Mr. Kenney.

445. The impediments are at the new quay, are they not?—Yes.

446. It is impossible at the present time, is it not, for vessels to come alongside the new pier or jetty?—Quite impossible; and even when it was alleged that the pier was completed and finished, and could be used for discharging, vessels could never come alongside the pier to discharge.

447. On whose representation was this new pier constructed?—I really am not aware as to that. Applications have been made several times for increased accommodation in Clare Harbour, in consequence of the difficulty of getting berths at the old quay, arising from the increase of the shipping down to the Port of Clare. Messrs. Bannatyne, and others, who would trade considerably between Limerick and Clare Castle, 0.89.

could not get the accommodation that was necessary in consequence of the increase of the shipping from the coast, and from other places; I refer to coasting vessels; and then they made an application for increased accommodation with a view of affording greater facilities for their vessels to discharge, and to find berths at Clare Quay.

Chairman.

448. Was that application made to the Board of Works, or to the Government?—To the Board of Works.

Mr. Kenney.

449. When the site was finally fixed upon by the Board of Works, I mean for the new pier, of course, was there any opposition on the part of the merchants in the town to fixing the site exactly where it was fixed?—Yes, there was some objection; they said it was an unsuitable site.

450. They recognised at the time that the site chosen was a bad site?—Yes, and it was predicted that if the pier was built on that site it would fall sooner or later; that they considered, owing to former experiments that were made by men acquainted with the business, who could not find a suitable foundation, when in former years they tried to find a suitable site for a similar pier. It was the opinion of experienced men; the master of Messrs. Bannatyne's boat, for example, always told me so, even when the pier was projected, and it was intended to have it placed in its present position; he over and over again told me that the pier would never stand, that the site was unfit and unsuitable in such a way that the foundation would not stand; it was considered at the time also that the works that were carried on in piling did not go deep enough; and it was even predicted in Clare Castle that, having regard to the way in which the work was carried on, it would not be a lasting work.

451. You are aware, of course, that the engineer to the Board of Works, Mr. Green, who was examined on the last occasion, has stated that these works were undertaken mainly for the purpose of giving relief?—I never heard anything like it.

452. It is a portion of his evidence given on the last occasion that these works were only 0.2 extended

1 May 1885.]

MR. HARRIS.

[Continued.]

Mr. Kenny—continued.

extended at an estimate, as he said, of from 2,000 *l.* to 5,000 *l.*, in order to afford additional relief to labourers out of employment in 1879 and 1880. In your opinion, so far, has this expenditure of 5,000 *l.* been perfectly useless?—Perfectly useless; and as you are aware, according to the report of Mr. Manning, the works that are being carried on now are estimated to cost at least 2,000 *l.* additional, so that that will make 7,000 *l.* for a work which originally, I understand, was estimated to cost only 2,000 *l.*

453. Is it your opinion as an ordinary layman, we will say, as distinct from an engineer, that the 2,000 *l.* which it is proposed to expend in addition will have the effect of making the pier safe for navigation purposes?—My opinion is, that if the 2,000 *l.* was expended on a proper site it would be better.

454. I am speaking of the present site; will you tell me what expenditure would be incurred on the present site in order to patch up this dilapidated structure so that it will be made an effectual and useful work for the purposes of navigation?—I believe that it would never be a good job. It is my opinion (and I would press it strongly) that all the works that are at present going on ought to be suspended; I believe that it will be a positive waste of public money to expend a farthing more in the endeavour to reconstruct, or re-build the works that are going on, and it would appear to me even, although I am an unprofessional man, and not an engineer, that the work which is at present contemplated and being carried out, is more for the purpose of concealing the bad work that has already been carried out, and that it is not for any good and useful purpose that the extended pier is proposed to be completed; I say this, because I hold that if the pier is extended as it is proposed to extend it on the present plan, the result will be that you will cause an obstruction in the channel of the river; and then not only will the pier itself be an obstruction, but imagine then a vessel moored outside that pier again, of course, the vessel itself will be an obstruction to vessels that pass up to the old quay higher up the river, so that you will have a permanent impediment and obstruction by the extension of the pier, as well as an occasional obstruction when vessels are moored alongside. I would beg the Committee to put a stop to any works that are going on.

Chairman.

455. You say that it would cause an obstruction; do you mean that if the pier were lengthened in any way, any addition made to it would cause obstruction, or that the present pier would cause obstruction to the navigation?—The present pier runs this way (*describing the position of the pier*). It is proposed to extend it further out into the channel, further out. Here is the old pier (*pointing it out*). This pier, the new pier, you will see by the photograph, has parted here, right in the centre, and the sustaining arches are altogether exposed; the water runs right through the centre of the pier; these strengthening rods are snapped; the framework that was placed around the pier has been torn asunder, and altogether, even in its present

Chairman—continued.

position, a foot-passenger would almost be afraid to walk on the pier. So that altogether it is an unsightly affair; it is an obstruction to the river; it is a needless work in every sense of the term, even if you tried to patch it in the way which is at present proposed, and if you extend it in the manner proposed into the channel, you will be causing a permanent obstruction by extending the pier and having a pier there; and along with it you will be putting a vessel outside which must necessarily, in order to discharge, lie alongside. The pier is almost the centre of the river, so that the vessels passing up to the quay, which is higher up, and which is a larger quay than the present pier, would, I think, become an obstruction which would seriously interfere with the navigation.

Mr. Kenny.

456. So that, in your opinion, the expenditure of 7,000 *l.* on this new pier is a perfectly useless expenditure?—Yes.

457. And that for the purpose of relieving the want of 1879-80, a permanent tax of 7,000 *l.*, equivalent at interest to something like 350 *l.* a year, is placed upon the revenue of Clare Castle?—Yes, of the Shannon navigation, as it is called.

458. But if this Bill passes, it would represent an annual tax of 350 *l.*, at least, upon Clare Castle Pier?—Yes.

459. And that for a work which is not only absolutely unproductive, but a positive nuisance?—Yes.

460. Being in every sense an obstruction?—Yes.

461. And in your opinion, representing the merchants and traders of Ennis, would it be better for the trade of Clare Castle if this so-called pier was removed altogether?—There is no question about it. The suggestion to the Board was that the pier should be cut off in the centre, where it has parted at present, as you see by the photograph, and from the line where the arch is; that the outside wall should be where the arches are at present, and that the bed of the river should be deepened, and then you would get rid of the obstruction and have a more safe and secure berth for vessels, by having it in a recess, as it were, of the river, instead of being placed out in the current of the stream, where it is proposed at present to extend it.

462. Do you think that any local body would be prepared to take over the Clare Castle Pier in its present condition from the Shannon Trust?—It would be one of the greatest mistakes that any local body could make, to undertake to take over a falling structure which has already collapsed, and such an obstruction as I believe it to be at present; it would be madness upon the part of any local body to undertake it, and it would be wrong, in the highest sense, for any public body; it would be madness to think that any local body would take such a millstone around its neck as to be saddled with the repayment in 25 years, as is suggested, of the loan for this excessive expenditure.

463. Were you present at the meeting of merchants and traders of Ennis, when this resolution

1 May 1885.]

Mr. HARRIS.

[Continued.]

Mr. Kenny—continued.

Mr. Kenny—continued.

tion was put: "That it is the opinion of this meeting that the pier and harbour of Clare Castle should be vested in a local body; but that we repudiate all liability for sums which have been hitherto expended by the Board of Works to construct a new pier, as we consider the money has been mispent; first, in its defective form; second, in the unsuccessful attempt that was made to keep it from falling; and third, the effort that is now being made to rebuild the original structure; we being of opinion that the surplus revenues of the port were more than sufficient to defray all the expenses that should be incurred in constructing a pier under proper engineering direction and management;" that is virtually, is it not, the summarised opinion of the people of Ennis?—Yes, I was present when that resolution was put to the meeting.

464. And they offered the strongest opposition to having foisted upon them this worthless structure, as well as the taxation incurred in the attempt to make it a useful work?—My opinion is that the pier ought not to be transferred to any local body until the present pier is made in such a way as will enable the local board to carry on the undertaking without any debt at all. A local board ought not to be made responsible for the mismanagement and the misapplication of the funds in connection with that pier, for the simple reason that the people feel that it was an unnecessary expenditure, and that if the money had been properly expended, this debt would not at all hang upon the port. There was more than sufficient surplus to the credit of Clare Castle alone to make good all the repairs that were necessary, and afford all the accommodation that was required for the trade of Clare.

465. You do not object to the principle of the Bill, that is to say, to transfer these piers to local control?—No.

466. But you are quite in favour of the principle of the Bill?—Yes, and I have always supported it.

467. What you object to, of course, is the handing over by the Board of Works of the expenditure which had been incurred, and uselessly incurred, and placing them upon your shoulders?—Yes.

468. And if the Board of Works proposed to relieve Clare Castle of this charge of 7,000 £, then you would have no objection whatever to taking over the control of the Clare Castle Harbour?—That is to say, provided that the pier was put in a serviceable state.

469. Provided at least that you were relieved of the charge of 7,000 £, or we will say of the charge of about 350 £ annually, which it would represent?—Then what would become of the old structure, that is Clare Castle new quay.

470. That would leave it where it is?—It is a worthless structure, it is crumbling and falling to pieces; every spring tide shows that it is a crumbling mass; the tide runs right through the fissures, as you see by the photograph. These sustaining arches can be seen.

471. It is a source of constant danger then, is it not?—Yes.

472. And in addition to being relieved of the charge of 7,000 £, equivalent to an annual charge of 89.

of 350 £, you would also require the Board of Works to remove this useless structure?—Yes, it is dangerous in any case. I look upon it as a dangerous piece of work in its present state.

473. So that you would want it carted away?—Yes, or the whole of the material of which it is composed; my opinion is also that if they put another pier outside it, that crumbling mass inside there will come toppling over against the solid masonry some day, and do damage.

474. Do you not think that there is reason for the Board of Works relieving the local board of this annual charge, not only on account of the alleged engineering incapacity of the Board of Works in this matter, but also in view of the fact that these works were originally undertaken for the relief of the poor of Clare?—I never heard that.

475. That has been stated in evidence already by the Board of Works engineer?—I never heard such a proposition at all.

476. Would not that be a reason why Clare Castle Pier should be relieved of this charge?—Certainly, if it was a relief work, Clare Castle ought not to be saddled with it.

477. That brings me down to this: in the event of the Board of Works consenting to relieve Clare Castle of this annual charge, what kind of local authority would you be in favour of?—I would rather that a Committee or Parliament would fix the local authority.

478. We want you here to advise us?—My advice is that the board or the trustees, or whoever they are, should be fixed by Parliament. I would not under any circumstances give the power to the Board of Works to appoint trustees on any consideration. I believe it would only be perpetuating a greater grievance, a grievance which would be more and more to give into the hands of a small body of men like the Board of Works the power of electing a local authority in a case such as Clare Castle, where a large community is interested; and more particularly, because Clare Castle is the only port for Ennis.

Mr. O'Sullivan.

479. What body would you suggest to whom to give the control of this pier?—Not to any local body; but I would form a body myself, and name them in the Act of Parliament.

480. Consisting of local men?—Yes, but not to any sanitary board, or grand jury, or town commissioners, or to anybody exclusively.

481. To an elected body?—Yes.

Mr. Kenny.

482. Will you answer this question. According to the definition of the clauses of the Bill which is at the present time before the Committee, "local authority means the grand jury of a county, or any urban or rural sanitary authority within the meaning of the Public Health (Ireland) Act, 1878." You know the grand jury of the county of Clare, you know the town authority, and you know the board of guardians of Ennis, including Clare?—Yes.

483. You are not in favour of any proposal to transfer the control of the pier to either the
c 3 grand

1 May 1885.]

MR. HARRIS.

[Continued.]

Mr. Keny—continued.

grand jury of the county of Clare or the board of guardians?—Certainly not; my opinion is that nobody ought to be selected for the Harbour Board except men who have commercial experience, and have some knowledge of the business connected with the port, and the benefits to be conferred upon the community, and the trading public, by having such a local board.

484. That is a good general principle; but I want to come to particulars as much as possible. Could you make any suggestions as to where the people should come from who would compose a suitable Harbour Board?—My idea was that the local landed proprietors, such as Lord Inchiquin and Colonel Paterson for instance, who are owners of the soil adjoining, and, I think, a local merchant like Mr. O'Brien.

485. You need not mention names. You would say, for instance, the four principal importers last year or their representatives?—Yes.

486. And are you in favour of giving the grand jury of the county or the board of guardians a representation; are you in favour of allowing the Ennis board of guardians to nominate four members as against four of the principal importers of the previous year, and, we will say, the lords of the soil, such as Lord Inchiquin and Colonel Paterson, which would give a board of 10 members; would that be a sufficient or a suitable board?—I would prefer having a board selected. If you would allow me to say so, I would give an idea of those whom I wish to name.

487. I know the gentlemen you mean, but the other members of the Committee do not; therefore it is no use your mentioning names?—I think the board of guardians, as a rule, knowing them as they are, could hardly be called qualified persons.

488. Supposing the Ennis Town Commissioners were reconstituted, would they be a suitable body to nominate?—I would not object to their nominating one or two of their members, but I would not give them the exclusive power.

489. It would be impossible, you think, to have a purely elected board on a high franchise, say a 20*l.* franchise?—No, I would like the board to be something like a board of trustees, named by Parliament, and that they would elect themselves, and so renew annually; because in the case of an elective board it is often the case that it is not the most fitting men that are put in.

490. And in the case of a board in which co-optation would be allowed, there would be always a danger of selecting the wrong man?—There would.

491. I would like, if you would give me the exact definition of the manner in which you would wish the board to be constituted; we have only got disjointed suggestions so far; you are not only representing your own views, but the views of the meeting that you attended the other day in Ennis of the principal merchants?—The opinion of the meeting was, that it was the local men, the merchants, the traders, and importers, who ought to be on the board, and no one else; men who had an interest in the Port of

Mr. Keny—continued.

Clare, it being also the Port of Ennis, and that no one at all outside Ennis or Clare Castle ought to be selected on that board.

Chairman.

492. But you mentioned the local landed proprietors; do you still say that they ought to be appointed on the board?—Yes. I think whatever board is formed, it would be fair that Lord Inchiquin and Colonel Paterson, who are the local proprietors of the land, should have some interest.

Mr. Keny.

493. You mean that they should be personally members, but that otherwise they would have no representation beyond themselves?—Yes, and their successors.

494. I speak of themselves, their heirs, and successors?—Yes. I say they ought to be on the board as representing the land; it would be well to have their co-operation in a case where we might require to have an extension of the pier or an improvement of the harbour.

Mr. O'Shea.

495. I want to ask you whether you think that dredging near the old pier would give sufficient accommodation for the old pier, that is, the old quay?—The old quay is built in solid rock, and dredging would not apply at all there; it should be quarried; it should be blasted. The old quay is built on a large rock.

Mr. Keny.

496. Is not the river bed in front of the old quay gravel?—There is a little gravel; outside, further out, it is soft bottom; but alongside the quay it is stone bottom.

Mr. O'Shea.

497. Colonel Paterson, whom you mentioned just now as a suitable man to be a member of the board, is likely to have some knowledge of the neighbourhood, is he not?—Yes, I think so.

498. If he supposed that dredging near the old pier could be done, and that it would give sufficient accommodation for the trade of the port, I suppose you would take his opinion as of some worth, would you not?—So far as the accommodation is concerned I would take no man's opinion at all. I know of my own experience what we want; and I am convinced that dredging would not do. You must extend the old quay, or you must give an increased accommodation in some shape or other. Dredging the river will not give length of accommodation; it would only give depth, and length is what we want.

499. With regard to the public body in whom this pier would be vested by the arrangement made under the proposed Bill, you come here as a representative of the traders of Ennis, do you not?—Yes.

500. Did you ask and ascertain beforehand from the gentlemen who attended the meeting, Messrs. Bannatyne and others, what their views were with reference to a board, or to a body, to whom this pier should be given over in case the Bill passed; are you giving your own opinion merely,

1 May 1885.]

Mr. HARRIS.

[Continued.]

Mr. O'Shea—continued.

mercy, or that of the majority of the people?—I am giving my own opinion, as well as the opinion of the majority.

501. They are identical?—I might say that I express the opinion of the community when I say that they hold that no one ought to be a member of the local board who is not commercially interested, such as local traders or merchants, importers or shipowners; that those are the class of men that ought to constitute the board.

502. Did they give you any opinion to express, or did you consult them with reference to their opinion as a means of founding and establishing that body?—There are diverse opinions. Some would say election by importers and exporters; that they should have the election of a board. Others would say that it was desirable to have it conferred on the constituency; others again suggested that the town commissioners, if they existed, ought to be the board.

503. So that there was no fixed opinion upon the subject?—The fixed opinion is that no one that is not locally interested, such as merchants and traders of Ennis and Clare Castle, ought to be on the board, and no one else but them.

Mr. Len.

504. As I am a stranger to the district will you tell me how far Ennis is from Clare Castle Pier?—About two miles.

505. You stated just now that the present old pier would not stand?—That is the present new pier. We have an old quay in Ennis, which was built some 40 years ago; that is the permanent structure, and not crumbling as the other one is. What we speak of now chiefly is the new pier, which has been constructed since 1879 or 1880.

506. Has any engineer stated so, or is it your own private opinion?—I am speaking for myself, of course; there are engineers who can go into that. I am only giving my experience as a man of business, as a commercial man.

507. As a business man, would you know if any representation had been made to the Board of Works with regard to the state of the pier?—I have made representations myself. I have written over and over again to the Treasury upon the subject.

Mr. Kenry.

508. Has there been continual correspondence between yourself and the Board of Works upon the subject?—Yes.

Mr. Len.

509. I think you said that the present cost of the works would be over 7,000*l.*?—Yes, taking General Sankey's statement; he says that in October, when he furnished his report, which is in print, the works had already cost 5,043*l.*, and he suggested then that an additional expenditure of 2,000*l.* should be laid out in order to rebuild or reconstruct or improve the present new pier. That is in print from General Sankey himself.

510. Mr. Green, the engineer to the Board of Works, who was examined last time the Committee met, put the cost at 4,182*l.*, I see?—I will refer you to General Sankey's Report.

0.89.

Mr. Lee—continued.

511. Do you include the extra 2,000*l.* in your estimate of over 7,000*l.*?—Yes. In October last, General Sankey stated in his written or published Report that there was already then expended the sum of 5,043*l.* on the pier, owing to the several imperfections, in order to try and maintain it; and that still, notwithstanding that expenditure of 5,043*l.*, the pier is still crumbling, and now they are obliged again to go to a further expenditure; and he suggests that 2,000*l.* more should be expended, in order to put the pier in a proper and permanent condition; the men are already engaged, an engineer and his staff are already employed, of course spending that 2,000*l.* additional, to put the pier in proper repair. Then, with that 2,000*l.* expended as it is proposed, the entire expenditure will be 7,043*l.*

512. You said just now that it would be better that the pier should be destroyed altogether, "taken away," I think, were your words; is that the general wish?—The opinion is, that the pier ought to be rebuilt and reconstructed on a better foundation, and in a more suitable manner, to afford the accommodation that the port requires.

513. Did I rightly understand you to say, that it was an obstruction at the present time?—Yes, because it is worthless.

Mr. O'Sullivan.

514. It is not sunk enough outside?—If you see the photograph you will understand it better (*displaying the same*).

Mr. Len.

515. I rather want to get at the discrepancy in the statement, you say that the pier is worthless; are you aware that the receipts of the pier have been 4,871*l.*?—Yes, I understand so from the Return. I wish, first of all, the Committee to distinctly understand that about 40 years ago the old quay was constructed by the Board of Works on a loan, repayable by the grand jury; that loan has been repaid, and the old quay is standing. In order to distinguish between the quay and the present structure, we call the old quay, the quay, and we call this new structure, the new pier. Of course the revenue of the port was altogether realised by the shipping coming into the old quay, and not to the pier. I do not think there was a five pound note, or two pounds taken at it, or anything at all received for a vessel discharging at the new pier.

Chairman.

516. Do you refer to last year or to the present time?—I believe that has been so since the pier was constructed, because it was always insufficient.

Mr. Kenry.

517. The new pier is not being used now, is it?—I went down myself on purpose to see it, and I saw a coal vessel discharging coal at the new pier. The vessel lay outside considerably, and it could not lay alongside the pier, because when the vessel got alongside the pier it slipped out again. I am aware that one vessel nearly capsized, owing to the bad formation of the bottom of the river alongside the pier.

0.4

518. May

1 May 1885.]

Mr. HARRIS.

[Continued.]

Mr. Lea.

518. May I just turn your attention to the question of the local authority to be constituted. You say that an elected body would not be suitable?—It depends upon what the constituency would be that you would see for the purpose. The question is whether it would be those who vote for the town commissioners or the exporters or importers. If you refer to the exporters and importers, they would be interested in the constitution of the board. I would not be in favour of an indiscriminate voting; the men would require some technical knowledge to sit on the Local Harbour Board.

519. Are you aware of any place where such a restricted system of voting is in force?—I think in Limerick it is more or less so; the exporters and importers there elect a certain number, the corporation elect some more, and some other body elect to the harbour board.

Mr. Synge.

520. You mean the Chamber of Commerce?—Yes; I think that is the principle. There is an export and import constituency, and then the Chamber of Commerce elects so many.

Mr. Keay.

521. You are aware that the Dublin Port and Docks Board is a very close borough?—Yes.

Mr. Lea.

522. Is there a Chamber of Commerce at Ennis?—I am sorry to say that there is not.

Chairman.

523. As I understand, what you suggest is that instead of transferring this harbour or pier to any board of commissioners, to the board of guardians, or to the county authority, it should be transferred to a harbour board to be elected upon some plan to be discussed either by the Committee or by Parliament?—Yes, I would like to have the board so constituted that no one but commercial men interested in the port would be elected. I do not care how you constitute the board, so long as that idea is carried out.

Mr. Lea.

524. Would you rather that Parliament nominated the harbour board, or would you prefer that the members of the harbour board were nominated by a local authority, such as the board of guardians and town commissioners?—I would prefer Parliament positively naming the board; that is my idea.

Mr. O'Sullivan.

525. Has this harbour and pier been always under the management of the Board of Public Works?—Yes.

526. Do you think that if a local body, no matter how it was elected, having an interest in property and otherwise, were formed, the business would increase?—Yes, if the pier were kept in good order, and if you give the body power to remove all impediments. What is the use of giving 14 feet depth of water alongside the quay when a vessel cannot pass the obstructions in the

Mr. O'Sullivan—continued.

river, and which, at high-water even, will not admit a vessel drawing 14 feet of water to pass? You must give the board power to remove the obstructions before the port can be really serviceable.

527. If there was a body of that kind, who would take an interest in matters of that sort, who would look to it and work it properly, do you think that the traffic of the port would increase?—Yes, I think it would be a flourishing port.

528. And you think that the traffic would increase considerably?—That is my opinion; at present, owing to impediments in the river, and the annoyance which masters of vessels receive from the want of suitable accommodation, they have an objection to come to Clare at all.

529. Is it the practice of some masters to unload at Limerick instead of Clare, owing to the impediments?—I heard of the case of a vessel going to Limerick to discharge instead of coming to Clare for that very reason.

530. Do you think that it is an injury to the harbour and pier not to have it better managed and cleaned; I mean an injury to the whole district?—I certainly do think so.

531. And do you consider that it would be a decided improvement to have it given to a body who would work it properly, and clear those impediments; do you think that that would improve the harbour and neighbourhood?—There is not a doubt of it.

Mr. Corry.

532. I only want to know what are the impediments which you refer to in the river?—First, there is a place called Behan's Rock, then a place called the Bar, and there are ugly turns and bends in the river, which it is very difficult to navigate.

533. Do not these bends exist in all rivers?—Not to such an objectionable extent as in the Clare River, where it winds and twists.

534. How far is this port of Clare Castle up the river from Limerick?—I think it is upwards of 40 miles or so from Limerick; it is about 30 miles odd to the Shannon; and then about as much more up to Limerick.

535. I heard you speak, when I came into the room, about the bad construction of the present pier; has that arisen from defective foundations or from defects in the design?—I think it has arisen from both. I think the foundation was not sunk sufficiently deep, and I believe (though I am not an engineer) that water percolated underneath the pier and carried it away. I think I saw a lot of mud brought out underneath the face of the pier, as if it were brought from underneath the piles.

536. Do I understand you to say that in your opinion, as a practical man, not as an engineer, but as a merchant, that it would be far better to sweep away all the present works and construct new ones?—That is my opinion. I am not speaking as a professional man, but as a man of business. I really believe that the works carried on at present ought to be suspended, and not a penny more laid out upon them until some proper engineer goes down and examines the place, and makes a report independently of the Board of Works.

1 May 1885.]

Mr. HARRIS.

[Continued.]

Mr. Gorry—continued.

Works altogether. In my humble opinion I think it is a waste of money that might be more usefully employed.

537. I suppose you know that other engineers, besides Board of Works' engineers, make mistakes about constructions?—We all make mistakes, of course. Another thing I would mention is this; I think that the Board of Works ought to have called a meeting of the traders and the people of Ennis, the importers and exporters, and to have asked their opinion as to the suitability of the site. The work was done altogether by the Board of Works and their engineer, without inquiring of anyone, so far as I am aware. They never consulted us as to whether it would suit us, or not.

538. Do you think that there would be a unanimous opinion amongst those using the pier and harbour, with respect to where a proper site should be?—One pier represented to me that they thought the old pier ought to be extended by cutting away the rock at the end of the old quay, and extending it down more to deep water; that that would have answered all practical purposes, and that the outlay would not have been anything like what it is.

539. With respect to the formation of this local body, you think, as I understand, that it would be better that it should be nominated by the House of Commons than even by the people who live in the district?—If it was confined to the exporters or importers, and to commercial men who have experience in such matters; and if it could be so arranged that they could elect the body themselves, it would be all the better; but I would not at all give the power to any local body to constitute the harbour board for Clare Castle.

540. I suppose you think that those interested in the trade of the port are the best judges of what is required?—That is my opinion.

Mr. Synn.

541. Does the new pier join the old pier?—If you give me a piece of paper, I will give you an idea of that. There is a gap between the two. The old pier is higher up the river than the new one (*derrisling the same*).

542. What is the distance between the old pier and the new pier?—It is a considerable distance; I could not really exactly state what it is; it is a long distance.

Mr. Kenny.

543. It is 100 yards, is it not?—I think it is more than 100 yards.

Mr. Synn.

544. The reason I ask the question is this: if a vessel wanted to go up to the old pier, it should sail alongside the new pier, and then it might not have sufficient depth of water to go up to the old quay?—Yes.

545. I want to ask you this. I only want the facts; did the people of Ennis, or the people of Clare Castle complain of the insufficient accommodation which the old quay gave them?—Certainly.

0.89.

Mr. Synn—continued.

546. Did they complain to the Board of Works that the accommodation of the old quay was not sufficient?—Yes, they did.

547. I understood your evidence to be this; that this Board of Works in a most unexampled manner *proprio motu* began this useless structure, and that they want to charge for it now; that is not the case?—No, the people required increased accommodation.

548. The Board of Works may be wrong in what they have done; but they did it upon the complaint of the people that the old quay was not sufficient?—Yes.

549. And they did it by carrying out a jetty from the old quay?—No, they did it from a part lower down the river altogether.

550. They carried it down to the channel of the river?—To deep water, to a part called the pool.

551. What is the depth of water that you have at the old quay?—I suppose it is 12 feet at high water.

552. Then it was to supply a complaint that the Board of Works went to the expense to execute this new pier?—Yes, to supply a want.

553. As you had only 12 feet of water for your vessels at the old quay, they wanted to give you 14 feet or 20 feet of water at the end of this new pier?—Yes, to give us increased accommodation. I must tell you that what made the complaint greater was that the Board of Works at present, and for some years past, occupy two berths of the old quay, which are used exclusively for loading stores for the sloe reclamation works, so that they have taken away two berths nearly of the old quay.

554. Will you answer my questions, if you please, and do not give me the history; when they began and laid out this site for a new pier, you, I believe, made a complaint about the site, did you not, to the Board of Works?—We were never consulted.

555. Did you never make any complaint of what they were doing, because the honourable Member for Ennis says you did?—I do not remember; it was only when we found the pier crumbling, that we made a protest against it.

556. When you found that the foundation upon which they built was bad, and that some of the piers were giving way and crumbling, and that you could not use the pier; in fact, after it was constructed, you found that it was a bad construction?—Yes, and could not be used.

557. But when the construction was commenced and during progress you did not complain; you were not an engineer, and you knew nothing about it?—No; we did not complain until we found there was cause to complain.

558. Let me have now distinctly from you what it is you say; do I understand you to say that this work upon which there has been over 2,000 £ expended, ought to be carted away like old rubbish?—There have been 5,043 £ expended upon it already, and there is an expenditure going on now of 2,000 £ additional to rebuild it; that is 7,000 £ altogether, according to the estimate of the Board of Works now to complete the pier; that would amount to 7,043 £.

559. That of course only increases the argument

D

1 May 1885.]

Mr. HARRIS.

[Continued.]

Mr. Sykes—continued.

ment that the additional expenditure arises from the fact that the work gave way?—It was badly constructed.

560. It was badly constructed, and the additional expenditure was incurred in order to supply the defects of that bad construction, is not that so?—Yes.

561. It amounts to 5,043 *l.* now, and it will amount to 7,000 *l.*; and in your opinion that 5,043 *l.* ought to stop, and the whole thing ought to be carted away like rubbish?—I would not cart it away, but I would use the material to make a better job.

562. Will you tell us now what you would recommend to be done; would you use the materials on the same site?—Yes.

563. How would you take them up and put them down again on the same site?—Nothing would be so easy as to remove the old materials; they are blocks of concrete.

564. Would you connect it with the old quay?—Not at all.

565. Would you leave it on the site as it is at present?—Assuredly; but I would not put it so far out in the channel as is proposed by the new work which is being contemplated and carried out now. I would have an extension into the bend of the river as proposed, but on the old site, or a little further inland.

566. What is the old site?—That is to say, the old site of the new pier; I would be inclined to move the old falling crumbling mass that you see there.

567. And lay it down new?—And seek a foundation far below its present extent.

568. You would make the foundation deeper?—Yes.

569. Is the foundation at present in rock or mud?—It appears to me that it is upon piles.

570. And you think that the piles gave way?—Yes, I believe the piles were not driven sufficiently deep.

571. Would you leave the additional structure as it is?—I would leave the whole of the pier as it is, and I would allow the same limits, the same extent of pierage; but I would remove the crumbling mass, and build upon the original site of the pier instead of extending it into the river, which I think is an objectionable thing.

572. You would not extend the length farther than it is at present?—What I want is for you to understand me; we do not want to lengthen the pier at all; it is the width of the pier from the land which is our point. I would go upon the same lines of the old pier, or the new pier, as we call it; I would go upon the same lines still, remove the crumbling mass, and build on a better foundation; I would not project the new pier, or build any structure outside the present quay wall as you see there; but I would simply knoll on the present site, and remove the crumbling mass.

573. You would rebuild a part of it?—Yes, and remove the crumbling mass.

574. I will not ask you any more on that subject; we shall have engineers to make that plain. You mentioned the matter of dredging connected with the old quay; is it not rock and gravel that is at the foot of the old quay?—It is

Mr. Sykes—continued.

on the front of the old quay?—It is on the front of it, the reek and gravel.

575. You could not dredge rock and gravel, could you?—I should say not.

576. With respect to this local board, we could not nominate the permanent board; we should either have them elected, or if we nominated individuals we should have to give them a succession?—I should give them a succession.

577. Do not be leaping before you come to the stile; is it not the proper thing to have the board elective as it is in Limerick?—Yes, it is, if you have a sufficient constituency.

578. I will give you a constituency; is it not the exporters and importers, and the owners of ships who are the real parties who are primarily interested in such a matter as this?—Yes, certainly.

579. Would not that be one body to elect?—Yes.

580. Have you town commissioners in Ennis?—No.

581. Are you going to have them?—That depends upon circumstances.

582. What has happened to them; were they not there; did you kill them?—They have ceased to exist; they become defunct.

583. Would you object to these commissioners having power to elect?—We have no town commissioners.

584. When you have them will you object to their having the power?—I do not know what posterity will do; but, of course, from the fact of their ceasing to exist, I would not be inclined to constitute them again.

585. You would not be in favour of them at all?—I would not; I helped to put an end to them.

586. To what second body would you give elective power, besides importers, exporters, and owners of ships?—In Limerick, you know, they have a Chamber of Commerce.

587. I am not talking of Limerick, but of Ennis?—If we had a local board, that would represent the local merchants in Ennis; I could understand appointing some members of that board to constitute the local board for Clare Castle, but when we have not a Chamber of Commerce, or a Corporation, the difficulty is to select the proper men to represent the business men, who are the exporters and the importers for us in Ennis.

588. Would not the importers and exporters represent themselves?—Yes, but then they would be a limited board.

589. Would not the merchants represent themselves?—They are rather limited.

590. Would you give the board of guardians the power of electing one or two?—I do not know, really; it is a difficult thing to say.

Mr. O'Sullivan.

591. Are not the shopkeepers and traders interested in the port?—I said so before; I said that if the harbour board were composed of commercial and business men, I should have no objection to it, but I would not bring in outsiders.

Mr. Ewart.

592. I should just like to ask you whether you do not think that the ratepayers should have an interest

1 May 1885.]

MR. HARRIS.

[Continued.]

Mr. Esart—continued.

interest in this matter, seeing that the authorities would have power to levy a rate?—I do not think that the local harbour board ought to be entrusted at all with power to levy a local rate for the improvement of the harbour.

593. But Clause 8 contemplates that power, does it not?—I would not give that power to them.

594. Then how would you provide for the maintenance of the harbour and the pier?—By the receipts.

595. Supposing that they were insufficient, or failed?—At present they are considerable; I think they average 350 £ a year, or so; and the expenditure is little or nothing.

596. I am afraid, that in your part of the world, you are disposed to live from hand to mouth, and not to look much to the future?—Our object in coming here is for the purpose of improving our port and the business, and to afford facilities for making Clare Castle the port for Ennis, the county town, and which is the only port, you may say, except Killrush, in the whole of Clare. That is the simple object we have in having the local board; because, before the Board of Works suggested they should be transferred, we wrote letters and suggested that it should be transferred to a local body.

Chairman.

597. Are you aware that before the site of this new pier was decided upon, the masters of the vessels engaged in the trade were consulted?—I never knew that until I saw it in General Sankey's or Mr. Manning's statement; I never heard of it before that.

598. Of course you are not able to state whether it is correct that that was done with their unanimous assent?—No, I do not know how 15 masters could be got together to decide such a question. It is rather an unusual thing to get 15 vessels into Clare Castle; it puzzles me to think how they could be got to decide such a question.

599. Is your objection to the new pier owing to its bad formation, as has been stated by you, or is it an objection to the place in which it is situated?—I would not object to the situation at all; in its present position, if it were properly constructed, it would be an advantage, because vessels could discharge alongside there, and could come in at a part of the tide, when they could not reach the old quay at all if they were going up to it. Vessels could discharge lower down when the new pier is built.

600. Then when you stated that you wished to remove the new pier altogether to the old site, you did not mean its removal from its present site entirely, but to some little distance back?—I would not remove it at all; the great objection is to extend the pier beyond its original limits; to extend it into the channel is an objection, and it ought not to be done. I would rather pull down the whole crumbling mass, and rebuild it upon a better foundation within the original limits.

601. I suppose it is the fact that the pier when it was opened for use showed no signs of cracking or imperfection in any way?—At first when the

Chairman—continued.

pier was constructed; that is to say, when it was originally laid down, and was nearly completed, it was found to split in several places; then the backing staff behind had to be removed, and thrown back on the land, and then there had to be what they call sustaining arches built.

602. That was after it was opened?—It was opened twice.

603. After the opening then?—That was the fact. It was first opened and found it to be splitting and giving away; then there were strengthening bars and sustaining arches, and a framework of timber placed there; then it was declared to be open a second time; and then it found after all that it was in a bad state.

Mr. Kenny.

604. The question is whether it ever was a perfect work?—Never; vessels could never sail alongside and discharge in the first place, owing to the impediment of mud and the old piles left alongside the quay; it was never a perfect work at any time.

Chairman.

605. You stated that you thought that the old materials could be reused; are you aware that only a very small portion is made of concrete blocks?—The whole quay is all concrete blocks, except coping, which is of limestone; the whole sea wall is made of concrete blocks, so far as I can see.

606. Are you aware that at least 1,000 tons of the material used was concrete in situ; will not those concrete blocks be concrete in situ still?—The only thing I saw that was not concrete was the filling up stuff thrown behind the quay wall. I know that the arches were built of concrete, and the sea wall, so far as my memory serves me, is all made of concrete blocks, and the top course appears to be a limestone course, and all that is twisted and bent, and has rents in it.

607. Do you remember having sent a letter on behalf of Messrs. Bannatyne to the Secretary of the Treasury in respect of this?—We wrote several letters.

608. What did these letters have reference to?—Complaining of the pier, so far as my memory serves me, and showing that it was crumbling.

609. Had not those letters reference to providing increased accommodation for the trade of Ennis and the district?—Yes; I also complained when I saw the pier crumbling and falling, dreading that it would fall into the channel and stop the navigation; it appeared to me that it was in danger of falling into the channel.

610. As I understand in an answer you made to one question, the Board of Works had provided this new pier upon their own representations entirely; that there had been no representations made to them by the district?—We always looked for increased accommodation; we wanted it.

611. Then what you first stated was not quite correct?—I do not remember stating that they did it of their own accord; but certainly we always looked for increased accommodation, or otherwise the vessels would have to lie outside.

D 2

612. I think

1 May 1865.]

Mr. HARRIS.

[Continued.]

Mr. Kenny.

612. I think you stated that there had been no consultation between any local body and the Board of Works?—Yes. I do not remember saying it was of their own accord, because we always looked for increased accommodation, and particularly since the dock works have been commenced, where they are occupying two berths with the stones required for the dock works.

Chairman.

613. With respect to the question of the proper authority to be constituted, if I rightly understand your evidence, it is this: that you want, as representatives, that certain persons, who would understand the management of the pier and the whole of the works, should be appointed as the harbour board?—Yes, commercial and business men, and exporters, and importers.

614. And representatives of the merchants?—Yes.

615. And representatives of local landowners?—Yes.

616. I presume that you would have some representatives of some local body?—Yes, if it could be well arranged. If there was a local body, and you could have representatives, it would be desirable.

617. How would you elect your representatives of the merchants; have you thought that over at all?—My idea was that they would be named in the Act of Parliament.

618. I suppose you are aware that if an Act of Parliament named a body that body would only exist so long as the persons existed; so that you must provide for their succession?—Then I would provide that they should retire by rotation, and that they should have the power of electing themselves, and that the three Members of the County should be added to the board. It would be easy to manage the succession; they could elect themselves; but certainly I think the three County Members ought to be added to whatever body is formed.

Mr. Kenny.

619. Have you considered the question of the 20 l. franchise which I suggested for Clare Castle; it is a 20 l. franchise in Belfast, is it not?—But then you should define the limits of the area; how could you do that?

620. There is another question which I wish to ask you: Colonel Paterson's name has been mentioned; is he a lord of the soil on one side of the river?—Yes.

621. Are you aware that he is non-resident in Clare at the present time?—Yes.

Mr. JOHN O'CONNELL, called in; and Examined.

Mr. Kenny.

624. You are a Civil Engineer?—Yes.

625. And you hold several positions in the county of Clare, and you are estate engineer on the property of Lord Leconfield?—Yes.

626. You know the port of Clare Castle?—Yes, I do.

627. And you know the approaches?—Yes.

628. And do you know the quay?—Yes.

Mr. Kenny—continued.

622. So that his nomination on the board would be simply an honour?—The only thing is, that the local people would like it.

623. Do you think that the 2,417 l. surplus revenue which the Shannon Trust have derived from Clare Castle should be handed over to the new local authority in question in case it was constituted?—If it were properly constituted, I would ask nothing but to let the works be given over free of debt.

624. Free of the 7,000 l.?—Free of everything.

625. The 4,305 l. to which the honourable Member for Dougal referred, was the expenditure on the new quay, and not on the old quay, was it not?—It was.

626. Both of those sums represent expenditure on the new quay, do they not?—Yes.

627. There is a Mr. Morony, representing the Board of Works, in charge of the works, is there not?—Yes.

628. And when you went there to photograph the works, did he endeavour to drive you away?—Yes; he shook hand with me and was very friendly, and he said personally he did not wish to be offensive, but that officially he must protest against my taking the photographs without getting an order from the board.

629. When you spoke of carting away the debris of the new pier, you meant that you would cart it away in the event of no really substantial work replacing it?—Yes, that is what I meant.

630. You spoke of the town commissioners, and you afterwards said that you took part in putting an end to the town commissioners of Ennis, and no doubt you are very proud of that. I want to know whether there is a strong feeling in Ennis in favour of the reconstitution of that body?—So far as I know at present, I do not know that.

631. In the event of a proper system of county government being established, are you in favour of a provision being put into the Bill to provide that the new county government should have the right to nominate members on the harbour board in case there was a composite board?—Yes, I would.

Chairman.

632. What is the population of Ennis?—6,500, I think.

Mr. Kenny.

633. And the population of Clare Castle is about 800, is it not?—Yes.

Mr. Kenny—continued.

639. You have seen the quay from time to time?—Yes.

640. And you have seen the new pier?—Yes.

641. With regard to the condition of the new pier, do you think the operations carried on at the present time will have the effect of making it a sound and useful structure?—As to that, of course

1 May 1863.]

Mr. O'CONNELL.

[Continued.]

Mr. Kenny—continued.

course I was in a difficulty to give you an opinion as to what the works will be when they are completed, not knowing what is proposed.

642. Do you know what the plans are exactly?—I do not; I have never seen them, and it is for the reason that I have not seen the plans that I said I was in a difficulty with regard to giving you an opinion.

643. You have seen the old pier?—Yes.

644. I mean really the new pier; this broken down pier.

645. With regard to this new pier (it is a sarcasm to have to speak of it as such), do you agree with General Sankey in his report, in which he speaks of the foundation of this pier. I had better read the extract: "To adopt a design, on the other hand, for carrying down the concrete wall everywhere to the underlying rock appeared to be beyond the available means and the alternative of the cheapest masonry design, which, following well recognised and sound engineering practice, held out reasonably good prospects of permanency." Do you think that the foundation, as sanctioned by the Board of Works, was a good foundation upon which to construct the pier?—I will give an opinion on the matter, and under the circumstances under which I know the pier and the river. I was not asked to deal with the quay specially; I was asked to examine the river with a view to improving the navigation of it, and the removal of certain obstructions which at present impede the navigation of the river. My attention was not directed to a minute examination of the pier structure or its foundation, or otherwise, but I am familiar with it, and my impression is that it is a failure entirely owing to insufficient foundation; that is to say, its had soft foundation.

Chairman.

646. When you say "insufficient foundation," do you mean insufficient so far as the works are concerned, or that it is a bad natural foundation?—A bad natural foundation; I believe from the appearance of the structure at present that its failure is owing to the settlement of the works for the want of a solid foundation; if I might further explain myself, I believe that if it rested on a solid rock foundation, the fissures and separations that are at present in it would not have taken place; I believe it would not have given way if built on rock.

Mr. Sykes.

647. What is the foundation?—It is mud, so far as I understand.

Mr. Kenny.

648. Are there wooden stakes driven into the mud?—I believe there were piles driven into the mud.

649. Have you heard that General Sankey has stated that a landslip occurred, and that it was owing to the occurrence of that landslip that this pier became broken down?—I believe he has reported so.

650. Do you believe it is owing to a landslip that this occurrence took place?—I never heard of any landslip; I am living close to the place. I did not take an interest in it except from knowledge.

Mr. Kenny—continued.

ing it casually, and it is as a casual observer that I am speaking of it.

651. Did you ever hear previously of such an occurrence as this? Mr. Green said that a landslip occurred, and I asked him, "Are you certain of that?" And he said, "I am certain of it; in fact it was very providential that the men at work were not killed at the time it occurred;" did you ever hear of such a narrow escape as that?—No.

652. Did you ever hear of a sudden movement of the pier?—No, I never heard of anything of the sort.

653. Was not every one of the movements and settlements gradual?—I always regarded it so, as a gradual thing.

654. And there was no such thing as a providential escape?—There may have been, but I never heard of it.

655. It is a mere imaginary flight, I daresay, on the part of Mr. Green; Mr. Green said that a landslip occurred while the pier foundations were being excavated?—Yes.

656. Do you think that the occurrence of a landslip at that time would not have taught an engineer of ordinary acuity that it was dangerous to continue to build upon a wooden foundation when a landslip had occurred, inasmuch as a further movement of the land would be likely to occur?—Your question rather complicates the matter in this way: if they were excavating in such a soil as that, they should provide against any falling in of the sides into the pit or the trench which they were excavating, because if proper precaution were not taken the sides would fall in, call it a landslip, or what you will. It would be decidedly dangerous for the operators, if it was any depth, should the ordinary precaution not be taken.

657. At any rate, it is your opinion that it was owing to the piles being driven down through the mud, and not to the landslip, to the pressure of earth from behind, that this occurrence took place?—From my observation of the structure I always attributed the settlement to the fact of its being resting on mud; and when I learn that there were piles of the nature that you are describing, I consider that they would really not tend much to the prevention of settlement, because of the very soft nature of the mud itself; it is sediment from the river; that would increase enormously in a short space of time owing to the muddy nature of the river, and piles, unless they were very firm indeed and well bound together for this work (ordinary small piles would be very likely to take an insufficient hold) would be insufficient for supporting such a weight of masonry.

658. And your opinion is, that the wooden piles had given way in different directions?—That would be my idea, and the natural thing to conclude.

659. And that the slipping away of the piles would be sufficient to cause the slipping away of the structure apart from the landslip?—Yes, that I surmise. I understand, not from any examinations of mine, but from what I have heard and seen, that the piles are driven in mud, which according to reports I have seen latterly is some 15 feet in depth before getting down to the solid rock; that is the number of feet quoted by the engineer.

D 3

660. You

1 May 1885.]

Mr. O'CONNELL.

[Continued.]

Mr. Kenny—continued.

660. You have to go down into the mud 15 feet before you get to the foundations?—That is before getting to the rock.

Chairman.

661. Was it not stated by Mr. Green that the piles were driven down to the rock?—I was not here when he gave his evidence.

Mr. Kenny.

662. Mr. Green stated, I think, that the piles were driven down either to the rock or to a hard foundation; and he said that no amount of pressure would affect the stability of the structure from the top, because the pressure was vertical, and that on account of the pressure being vertical upon the piles it could not affect them. I want to know whether you can explain this to me, because it is rather conflicting with the evidence of Mr. Green. Mr. Manning says, "A quantity of 800 tons of timber was loaded on the wharf in the months of June and July, 300 tons of which remained piled on about 50 feet in length of the quay till the middle of September. Although a slight subsidence took place on the 1st September, no fears were entertained of serious danger taking place, which, however, unfortunately occurred between that date and the present." What could Mr. Manning mean by attributing the subsidence to, or stating that the subsidence might have been owing to the pressure of 800 tons of timber, or at least 300 tons of timber, placed within an area of 70 feet in length, when Mr. Green stated himself that the additional pressure would only make the thing more solid.

663. It is a contradiction that cannot be reconciled?—I could not undertake to explain their differences.

664. Speaking of the dredging in front of the pier, Mr. Green seemed to think, in conjunction with General Banker, that dredging or removing the mud in front of the new pier might have also had the effect of hastening the collapse of the structure; they say that there was a kind of dredging carried on in front of the pier; what is your opinion with regard to that?—I am inclined to agree that that would endanger the structure.

665. That would be an additional reason, showing an additional necessity for dredging the bed of the river there, so as to allow ships to enter; and it would be an additional reason, would it not, for a sound engineer to object to wooden piles being driven down?—That would be a sufficient reason with a view of deepening the river at that point. Of course if they were to go below the bottom of the foundation of the masonry, the natural consequence would be that it would endanger the safety of the structure.

666. And would you say that that would be a sufficient reason for an engineer at the beginning to object to drive those wooden piles down?—I do not quite follow your question.

667. What I say is this, a sound engineer would originally, when designing the work, have preferred some other species of foundation to that of the wooden foundation, seeing that it would be necessary to dredge the river in front of the wooden piles; do you agree with me?—If the whole subject is to be considered,

Mr. Kenny—continued.

if you ask me what I would do if I wanted to make a sound structure, assuming there is a rock, I should try to get down to the rock, with a view not only to the safety of the structure as it then existed, but having in view the further deepening of the river, I should not like, were the river to be deepened, to go below the bottom of the foundations.

668. And is it your opinion that if the foundations had been originally carried down to the rock at the bottom, which is 15 feet below the bed of the river, according to the evidence of the engineer of the Board of Works; if the solid foundation stone had been carried down to that, there would have been no such thing as displacement, movement, or settlement?—I think that is the general opinion; I do not think even the officers of the Board of Works could have any other opinion.

669. But that is your opinion, at any rate?—Yes.

670. That is enough with regard to the structure itself. Now with regard to the governing body, have you arrived at a conclusion as to what should be the composition of the harbour board?—As I have said before, I was asked my opinion more with a view to the improvement of the navigation of the river, and certain traders and merchants in Kinnis have consulted me frequently with regard to it. I can state my idea of such a body, if I might venture to give an opinion upon the matter.

Chairman.

671. Is the Committee to understand that you are expressing your own opinion?—Yes, entirely. My opinion is, that such a body should be formed in the first instance of either four or five, or whatever proportion might be decided on, of the shippers, that is the merchants, exporters, or importers, of the town of Kinnis. I should then say, that the Corporation or the Town Commissioners in Kinnis should have the power of electing a proportion, say either one or two, to represent the shopkeeping population; I would then give the lords of the soil a right to representation on the board. I believe there are two or three, or four, or five, that might be considered the landowners about the whole of the port of Kinnis, but I would limit them to the immediate locality of the harbour, say to two or three. That would be my idea of the constitution of the board.

Mr. Kenny.

672. You are aware that to transfer the Clare Castle Harbour to a local authority would mean transferring the debts incurred in carrying out these works to some local authority; that is the proposal of the Bill, is it not?—I read the Bill casually, and the impression on my mind was, that it would be so.

673. And that would involve a considerable annual charge upon the revenue of the harbour, would it not?—So far as I have gone into the matter, I understand that the tolls collected at Clare Castle amount in such a sum annually as would be barely sufficient to meet such charges.

674. And that would leave of course no funds for the purpose of facilitating the navigation of the river, and the approach to the quay?—I believe

1 May 1885.]

Mr. O'CONNELL.

[Continued.]

Mr. Kenny—continued.

Here that if the navigation of the river were improved the tolls would largely increase.

675. And you believe that the expenditure upon the river, in removing certain impediments to the navigation at the present time, would have the effect of increasing the revenues?—I regard such an expenditure as much more important than any expenditure of erecting a quay at present.

676. You mean than any expenditure upon the new pier at present?—Yes, at present.

677. If the funds of the new authority were exhausted in paying interest on all debts not incurred by them, there would be no funds left to carry out the necessary improvements that you speak of; I say, if the annual tolls derived from ships, and so on, had to go to pay the interest on those debts incurred by the Board of Works, and transferred to the local authority, naturally there would be no surplus to carry out those improvements that you consider necessary?—I am not aware exactly what the expenditure is, or what the tolls are; it is hearsay evidence on my part.

678. But the engineer to the Board of Works has admitted that point; he has admitted that the amount which would have to be contributed annually to meet the interest on the old debts would swamp the annual revenue of Clare Castle?—Yes; and he knows much better than I do.

679. I think you are of opinion, are you not, that the rates set down in the Schedule of the Bill, to be charged to the several harbours, should in the case of Clare Castle be increased?—Yes.

680. At the present time the scale in the schedule is somewhat less than the harbour dues charged in Limerick, is it not?—I believe it is.

681. Do you think that the harbour dues charged in Clare Castle should be assimilated to the harbour dues charged in Limerick?—Yes, I think so.

682. You think that would be advantageous to the port, do you?—I do; and I can give you a reason if you wish me to give you an explanation.

683. Do you consider that the removal of certain obstructions further down the river, such as the Crow Rock and the Bar Rock, and others of those places, are necessary?—I may say that that is the main question I was asked to come over to give my opinion upon.

Chairman.

684. That is not within our reference, I think?—That I did not know.

Mr. Kenny.

685. It is not within the scope of the investigation, really; but I want to connect it in this way; not to dwell upon it, but to show that it is a point of value in the consideration, and essential to the consideration, because the future condition and the financial prosperity of the harbour depends upon these impediments being removed; and if the future Harbour Board is saddled with that debt, they will not be in a condition to carry out these works; so that it is connected with the subject, is it not?—That is my opinion. I may say, if I may be permitted

689.

Mr. Kenny—continued.

to do so, that certain shippers and importers in Ennis have at present solicited me to examine the river with a view to represent that before you; and it is at their request that I am here.

Chairman.

686. Is this a matter quite in the immediate neighbourhood of the pier?—Yes, it is the approach; I think it my duty to show you (in fact, I will not go further than this). I am aware of the fact that there are certain merchants and importers living in Ennis, timber merchants and others, who really consider the question of removing the obstructions in the river and putting up certain booms, and so on, of more importance to them directly than the expenditure on the quay is at present.

687. Has this matter of the obstruction been brought before the Board of Works?—I do not know it of my own knowledge, but the gentlemen who spoke to me say that it has been brought before the Board of Works. I may explain that I understood from them that the Board of Works gave them to understand that they had not the power to deal with it, and these gentlemen wish some clause to be embodied in the Bill before Parliament to give this local authority, or whatever body is decided upon, ample powers to expend the tolls in improving the navigation of the river.

688. In improving the navigation of the river?—Yes; in improving the navigation of the river by the removal of obstructions, and by the erection of beacons on certain half-tide rocks, which are very dangerous to the navigation, and that they ought to have some system of pilotage.

Mr. Kenny.

689. Are you aware (it appears in the Treasury Minute referring to Clare Castle Pier) that the Board of Works did volunteer to expend the sum of 20 £ on condition that the Shannon Trust and the Irish Lights Board contributed an equal sum to put a beacon on Boland's Rock, and that those two authorities refused to incur an expenditure of 20 £ for that purpose?—I do not know what the facts are in reference to that.

690. It appears in the Treasury Minute, which, of course, is before the honourable Chairman?—I did not know that. I heard that there was some discussion on the matter, but I do not know the facts.

691. I will ask you one further question with regard to this branch of the matter; hitherto, no steps have been taken, have they, by any authority, for the purpose of improving the navigation of the Fergus River?—None within my own knowledge.

692. With regard to the composition of the Local Harbour Board, could you state fully your exact views upon that subject?—I think I have already clearly stated that in answer to the honourable Chairman.

Mr. O'Shea.

693. I want to ask you whether the carriage of goods from the new pier is not longer and more expensive than from the old quay to Ennis?—If you mean that the carriage from the new pier is longer than from the old quay, it is by a

D 4

distance

1 May 1885.]

Mr. O'CONNELL.

[Continued.]

Mr. O'Shea—continued.

distance of about 200 or 300 yards; but there is a road made down to it.

694. Would it not have been as easy and less expensive to deepen the river, so as to allow vessels of a tonnage of some 400 tons to go to the old quay than it has been to build the new pier?—I do not think it would have been less expensive. You get into rock near the foundation of the old quay. I am talking now of what it should cost to build a structure such as in my opinion would be sufficient at the new quay.

695. I mean the money that has been, or is to be, expended?—Yes, if it amounts to anything like what I have heard, namely, 7,000*l*. You are asking me a question that I have not taken into account. I have not heard it, but I do not think it would be a wise thing to undertake the deepening of the river at the old quay.

696. Originally, would it not have been a better scheme to deepen the river so as to allow vessels of 400 tons, say, to come to the old quay, and would that not have been a cheaper mode of improving the accommodation in the harbour than spending the money they have done on this new pier?—No, I should prefer to have gone into the deep water, because the difference in depth is considerable. To deepen the river opposite the old quay to the depth required would entail a great quantity of rock excavation in the bed of the river.

697. At the present moment the new pier is no use at all, is it?—No ships could approach it of course; it is fractured and falling, and in such a condition that you could not use it.

Mr. Lea.

698. Is the new pier not used at all?—At present it is surrounded by scaffolding (I have not made a minute examination of it), but they are at work in some way; I believe that they are building another structure outside of it.

699. Do you consider that it is in a rotten state?—I consider that it is in a very unsafe state; there is only one opinion upon that.

700. The last witness stated that people predicted from the first that the new pier would not stand?—I dare say that a great many people hazarded opinions about that.

701. Did you hear anything of the kind?—I heard several express the opinion that it would not stand.

702. Your idea is that it is a gradual settlement?—Yes, a gradual settlement.

703. And that it was not put upon a faulty foundation at first?—It was not put upon a sufficiently solid foundation, whether natural or artificial; it is evident that the want of a solid foundation causes the settlement.

704. Do you know of any other places where piles have been used in building piers under similar circumstances?—It is a thing very commonly done; to make an artificial foundation is an every day occurrence.

705. But I say to make piers under similar circumstances?—Where they have been used, you mean?—Yes.

706. Yes?—Not to my knowledge. I cannot quote one instance where they have been used under similar circumstances; because the circumstances in this case are rather peculiar. It is all

Mr. Lea—continued.

alluvial deposit there, not only in the bed of the river at present, where it silts up quickly if there is not a scour, but the country round is all slob land, and where it adjoins the river it is peculiarly soft; and it was on the sloping edge of the bank or the verge of the river, of course, that those piles were sunk, so that instead of piling there, as I said before, I should prefer doing what the Board of Works are doing at present (as their engineer told me), going down to the solid rock.

Mr. O'Shea.

707. They are doing that now, you say?—Yes; so the local engineer told me.

Mr. Lea.

708. You would do it with stone foundation instead of piles?—Either stone or concrete.

709. I want to ask you this: do the impediments in the river apply to Clare Castle Pier only or to the river generally?—It is the only port on the Fergus. If you look at the chart of the place you will see that it is so.

710. I understand now what it is?—It is not on the Shannon at all; it is 20 miles up the River Fergus.

711. You say that the increase of charges which you refer to would bring the dues at Clare Castle equivalent to the Limerick dues; would that be satisfactory to the merchants of Ennis?—I think it would be highly satisfactory in its results if the local body, as I said before, I mean the pier authority, constituted under the Act, had power to deal with the navigation of the river, the improvement of it, the removal of obstruction, putting the buoys, beacons, &c., and the constitution of some system of pilotage. I say, then, it would be a great advantage, not only to shippers, but to the shipowners and ship masters, who at present dread coming up the river. I may tell you of a case within my own knowledge. A merchant the other day chartered a cargo of timber from the Baltic; the ship came into the river and came into the Fergus estuary; but hearing of the bar, which is the great bazaar of the river, the master would not bring his ship up; but he consented to do so afterwards if he got an additional sum of 40*l*. to bring her up.

712. With regard to the constitution of the authority, you said that four or five of the merchants of Ennis should be appointed?—That is my idea. You might put them to whatever proportion you like, but I would take the board or local authority, as I said in the first place, from the importers and exporters of Ennis; and, in the second place, if the town commissioners existed, I would give them the right of nomination in proportion; I would say, in the proportion of two to four.

Mr. Synge.

713. In fact you propose to repeat the answer you have given already?—Yes.

Mr. Lea.

714. But I did not understand how those members should be elected; I do not think you have stated that; will you give the Committee your ideas upon that subject?—The Bill proposes to give the Board of Works the power.

715. That

1 May 1885.]

Mr. O'CONNELL.

[Continued.]

Chairman.

Mr. O'Sullivan—continued.

715. That is to say, the power to prepare a scheme?—Yes; and if I were asked, under those circumstances, I would say that the Board of Works, the Treasury, or some other body, could easily, acting under proper representation from the merchants, decide who had established the best claim for the purpose. It is, of course, a question as to who are the largest importers; and I should say, by all means give the largest importers the right of precedence on it.

Mr. O'Sullivan.

716. Could you make the new pier sufficient for all the traffic coming there, if you had sufficient funds?—Do you mean the structure that is being discussed now.

717. I mean could you make the new pier sufficient for all the traffic now coming there, if you had sufficient funds at your disposal, without using the old pier at all?—The old pier at present is a necessity. The necessity for the new pier arose, I may tell you, from the foreign timber trade. Large shipmasters coming in, do not like to bring their vessels up to a pier which the water leaves entirely lying high and dry in fact; and although the water is not sufficient at high tides to float a vessel at the new pier, still they would be lying upon a different bottom, where it is soft mud, and would not be liable to the same injury as if they were lying upon hard rock.

718. Then are the Committee to understand that the traffic is so great there, that the new pier would not be sufficient without the old pier also?—Certainly.

719. For the smaller class of ships?—Yes; I have seen along the line of quay vessels lying in the river waiting to get a berth.

720. What do you think the probable cost of making a complete and a good job of the new pier would be?—To make a complete job of the new pier at present, I do not know; I should be very much afraid to undertake it there at all. It is attended with considerable difficulty, and any one with any knowledge of the matter would prefer, instead of building near a structure that is shifting or moving at all, to go away from it, because it would be safer. If you ask me my opinion as to what I would do, I would much prefer, if I had the money to expend, whatever the amount of it might be, to keep away from a structure already showing signs of shifting and altering its position. I would be much afraid of the consequence of this mass of masonry, as it is at present, if it did not settle down or assume some stationary condition, it might ultimately affect in some way, injuriously, a structure erected near or outside of it.

721. With regard to the harbour or pier dues, would you be disposed to charge as much in a small port like Clare Castle as in a large one like Limerick?—I propose to charge as much in Clare Castle for harbour dues as they would at Limerick, because I think the development of the port, that is the improvement of the navigation of the port, would be more than ample compensation for any increase in the present rate of tolls.

722. Then if all this was done, and proper no-
0.89.

commodation was given, you think that your traffic in future would increase considerably?—I do; I think there would be a very considerable increase. The reason why I think so is this, as any merchant would tell you, in some cases, such as grain, and other commodities, naturally if the port were improved they would come to Banks as being the port of Clare, instead of having to go to Limerick and discharge there, as in the case of Messrs. Bannatyne having to reship from Limerick to Clare Castle in smaller vessels.

Mr. Kenny.

723. That is being constantly done at the present time, is it not?—Every day.

Mr. O'Sullivan.

724. I think you said that you would like the constitution of the board to be composed of shippers, and traders and owners of property?—I do not know whether you wish me to repeat what I have said upon the matter again, but I have already expressed that view.

Mr. Corry.

725. You have not, I believe, professionally examined the structure of the old pier, and also that of the new pier?—I have not done so professionally. I have not made a minute examination of the foundations, and is fact my attention was not directed to the structure at all.

726. But your attention was directed to the approaches?—Taking the whole thing, the whole of the port and harbour, I looked at both the new and the old harbour, but I never examined the foundations by boring or any such thing, I simply know the port from observation.

727. You say that the soil is alluvial there all along the river?—All along the estuary of the Fergna.

728. It is quite possible, is it not, that the scour of the river has shifted the mud from those piles that were driven into it, and the result is that the piles have slipped out?—Such a thing is quite possible, but if you ask me my opinion about it, I am under the impression that that is not what happened, and I will explain to you, if you wish it, why. The situation of the pier is at an angle or bend of the river; and I think that the tendency would be of this kind. The pier exists here, the river comes in this way, and takes a turn (*describing the same*); the water would naturally go over to the other side of the river, and not against the pier at all. In fact, I think the tendency would rather be the other way, to cause an eddy here, and a silting up against the new structure.

729. We have heard of a quantity of timber being stored upon the quay; do you not think that that would very likely tend to push out the old structure?—I have no doubt it would; I think it would take very little to push it out; I should not like at present to put many tons weight upon it.

730. Do you think that the storage of timber there would prejudicially affect the structure altogether?—I most decidedly think it would; I should not like, as I said just now, to put much weight upon it.

E

731. Is

1 May 1885.]

Mr. O'CONNELL.

[Continued.]

Mr. Corry—continued.

731. Is it not a common mode of construction for piers and harbours to build them upon piles?—It is, of course.

732. And there is nothing faulty, so far as that is the case, if the foundation is good?—I do not know what sort of piling they have adopted, but I repeat the opinion that I have already given, that it was owing to the want of a sufficiently solid foundation that the structure has given way, and whether that foundation is natural or artificial, it is certainly a want of solidity that causes the failure of the structure. With regard to the weight of timber pressing it downwards or outwards, of course, if such a weight of timber as is required for the discharge of ordinary vessels is likely to alter the shape of a structure of that kind, it is practically useless for its intended purpose, if it cannot bear the weight of a few hundred tons of timber.

Mr. Kenny.

733. If it could not bear the weight of a few hundred tons of timber it would not be much use, would it?—No.

Mr. Corry.

734. I could take you to more important places than Clare Castle where you cannot put a few hundred tons of timber on the quay. With reference to the harbour dues being increased, do you not think that that would act prejudicially against the importers and exporters at the Port of Clare?—I think it would have the contrary effect, for the reason that they already pay dues when they go to Limerick and discharge there; they have to pay dues there, and reship, and then pay the dues of the Port of Ennis.

735. I see what you mean, you would have only the dues of Ennis, provided that the ships could come up without calling at Limerick at all?—It would have a twofold aspect. It would save money to the public, and it would also have a tendency to increase the tolls of the Port of Ennis.

736. You say that a vessel refused to come up the river the other day, unless the captain was paid a higher rate of remuneration?—The merchant to whom the cargo was consigned told me so, and he was in great difficulty in consequence, and whether he consented to give the 40*l.*, or whether the ship came up, I cannot tell you.

737. Is it not a common practice for ship-owners and captains to follow if they find any clause in the charter party that enables them to do it?—I cannot tell you that; I am telling you that there is an obstacle that should be removed.

Mr. Sykes.

738. You have been asked whether it would not have been more prudent for the Board of Works to let the old quay stand, and to have the river dredged, than to build this new pier, which has been a total failure; would not the effect of dredging be to leave the river to silt up with mud, and that alluvial deposit, which is continually going on in the River Fergus, supposing that you did dredge, would it not fill up again by silting as it has done at Foynes; you could not dredge at the site of the old quay, because the foundation is solid rock there, but supposing that you dredged below it under the site of the pre-

Mr. Sykes—continued.

sented new pier, would it not fill up again by silting?—Yes, the tendency in rivers of this kind is always to require dredging; in nearly every case rivers do require dredging from time to time.

739. Then it will become necessary of course to construct some new structure to carry you out into deep water, is not that so?—That is so.

740. If the Board of Works had bored before they piled, do you think this settlement would have taken place, that is to say, if they had bored properly until they had come to a more solid foundation?—That is to say, if they had carried their foundations down to solid rock, or if they had carried their work up.

741. If they bored until they came to solid rock, or whatever it was, that is to say, if they bored sufficiently before they piled, would they not have saved this settlement?—I have already said that if they had gone down to a hard natural foundation, I do not believe that this settlement would have occurred in the work. It is a concrete structure, and so far as I can judge, the structure in itself would be sufficiently sound, and any fracturing or settlement of a serious nature would not have occurred in it. As I have already said, I believe that the fractures or defects in the structure have occurred altogether through the want of a solid foundation.

742. What I want to come at is how that solid foundation was to be ascertained?—In two ways; it would be either natural or artificial. A natural foundation would have to go down to rock or gravel, or whatever other stratum there was that was sufficiently hard.

743. In order to do that you should remove the 15 feet of mud, should you not?—Yes.

744. What would be the other plan?—The other plan would be by making an artificial foundation or piling, forming a firm platform on which to build.

745. Then they did pile?—It appears so.

746. But not sufficiently?—At any rate a fall has taken place in the structure.

747. That must arise from the sinking of the piles, must it not?—It is from the want of a solid foundation.

748. It is from want of solidity, where the piles would settle and sink, and then a settlement came?—They might get displaced in other ways; they might go this way or that way in the soft mud when not well bonded together. I have already said that in such a situation, to go down to a natural foundation, as the Board of Works, I believe, are doing themselves at present, as the local engineer has told me, to go down to hard rock would be the proper course. That would be my idea.

749. Is it possible to do that at present; will you take that photograph in your hand and refer to the evidence that was given by Mr. Harris; Mr. Harris says, that by removing it from there to there (pointing to the photograph), and putting it upon a solid foundation, you could repair the injury that has been done?—I have given you my impression of what I should do under the circumstances.

750. Would that be sufficient?—I did not follow Mr. Harris exactly.

751. Will you give us your own mode of remedying the work, if there is any mode of remedying

1 May 1885.]

Mr. O'CONNELL.

[Continued.]

Mr. Symon—continued.

medying it?—I am not prepared to state what I would advise with reference to it. If you gave me a certain amount of money I should prefer to go either above or below, either up stream or down, and expend the money there. I believe that the erection of anything outside of it is, practically, a new pier or quay, so that the present structure that you see there does not facilitate the erection of the new quay at all; you might as well go above or below it.

Chairman.

752. Supposing that you went above or below it, in your opinion would it not become a dangerous obstruction?—I think that some steps should be taken to prevent its falling into the river.

Mr. Symon.

753. Do you think that it should be taken away?—My own impression is that if you took away the filling which exists behind it (and I think some of it was removed), the outward tendency of the structure would then cease.

Mr. Kenny.

754. Have not the relieving arches, which were placed there by the Board of Works, to a certain extent, also moved forward? Mr. Green stated that they had, in his evidence; that one has become damaged and the others dislocated?—Yes, they have.

Mr. Symon.

755. I was examining you upon your own evidence, and I wanted to see whether you would say that you would keep away from the new pier altogether?—Yes, I would if I were going to erect another pier.

756. That is the only mode that you would propose; is not that so?—Yes.

757. And you would give this further answer, would you not, that even if you did this, there would be a danger that the old pier would affect the new structure?—If you erected a new structure, or rather a future structure, outside the one that is represented in the photograph, I think it would be much better for the safety and security of the new structure not to build it outside the old structure at all, but either above or below it; either up stream or down stream. My opinion is, that it would be much safer to erect a future structure there.

758. How would you connect the future structure with the old quay in that case?—I would not seek to connect the future structure with the old quay.

759. Would you go over this new pier then?—Not necessarily.

760. How would you come to the old quay?—If it were up stream, you would not require to go to the old quay at all.

761. You would come to new land?—You would arrive at the future structure before you would come to the structure represented in the photograph. If you will let me explain it on the map, I will do so.

762. How would you come to the land in your future structure; will you show us where your future structure would be connected with 0.89.

Mr. Symon—continued.

the land at Clare Castle?—That is Clare Castle; the old original quay stands there, and the new quay which we are at present discussing stands there (*pointing them out*).

763. It goes down to deep water, does it not?—Yes, that is the position of it. I say that if I were going to erect any kind of structure there requiring any expenditure, practically making a new quay, I should either go up or down on this side or that (*describing the same*). If it should be this side (*pointing to it*), you would arrive at this future structure before you came to the old quay. In going down here, if you erected a structure there, you would not necessarily have to pass this (*describing the same*).

764. You would go over the old quay?—There is a road at present there; that is the natural approach.

765. What would happen if you erected it here?—Then you would have to pass down and make an approach to it. (*The Witness described the suggestions on the plan to the Committee.*)

766. What would be the cost of that?—I am not prepared to give you an estimate of that; I have not gone into the subject.

767. Will you give me an opinion?—I cannot do so.

768. What is the cost of that new structure?—The original estimate for it, I hear, was 2,000 L.; that was the estimate of the Board of Works.

769. And what do you think that your structure would cost?—I have no structure in my mind; it would depend upon the extent of it; it might be 100 feet or 150 yards.

770. Supposing it were a structure of the same extent?—I have made no plans or measurements; that would depend entirely upon whether there was the same extent, the same length of pier. If you had to build it of concrete or masonry, I suppose it would be a matter of 3,000 L. or thereabouts, I may say, roughly; but I have made no estimate one way or the other.

771. I do not want to bind you in the least?—I have no means of giving you an estimate.

Mr. Len.

772. Have you made a full examination of this pier about which we are speaking, or only a casual inspection?—I am taking altogether the statement I have seen made by the engineers of the Board of Works, who have said that there are 15 feet of mud there; I have not examined the mud beyond that; I know that there is mud there, but I do not know to what depth it goes.

Chairman.

773. I suppose, from the evidence you have given, you are not aware that the present new pier is actually founded upon piles that are driven down into the hard ground?—I am not aware of that.

774. Supposing that is the case, still the pier might have subsided and given way from other causes. It is quite possible, is it not, that the piles may have been driven down to the hard ground?—It is quite possible.

775. It is the fact, I believe, that at Foyens the piles are driven down to the hard ground; they were of the same kind, and in that case there

1 May 1885]

Mr. O'CONNELL.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

there has been no settlement at all?—That is quite possible.

776. Are you aware that a landslip did occur very early in the progress of the works?—I have never heard of any landslip except what I have heard of in the Report to the House of Commons, either by General Sankey or some other gentleman; it was not a local report. I heard that there was some shifting or damage to the structure when the works were in progress, or shortly after the completion of the works, but I never heard it described as a landslip at all until I saw it in that Report.

777. Supposing that your proposed plan of constructing a new pier on a new site was carried out, would not that lead to very considerable additional expense, in this way: there would be not only the cost of the new pier, but you must in some way get rid of the pier which has already been built, that is, the present new pier?—When you say my plan, I have not got a plan of my own.

778. Then I will not say your plan, your proposal?—My plan, so called, has simply arisen out of the questions put to me. I was asked by one honourable Member what I should do, and I say that if I had to expend the money which it would probably be necessary to expend in erecting this further structure outside the present one, I should prefer to take it either above or below the present falling structure, for the reason that I would be afraid that the future structure would suffer, owing to the tendency of this present structure to shift its position, and move right, left, and centre outwards.

779. Supposing that the new pier can really be made satisfactory and substantial, would not it be better than having the expense not only of building another pier, but of removing the present structure?—I do not see that the process of removal might become necessary. I think by removing perhaps the earthwork that was thrown in behind, the chances are that instead of going outward it would tend inward. I attribute that as one of the causes, or rather I give it as one of the likely causes of its shifting: that when the pier was erected, and when the filling in got behind it, the weight of the earthwork behind would of course have a tendency to thrust out the pier, especially when it had not a good foundation to rest on. Therefore, if you take away that inside pressure you relieve the pier by so much, and of course it would be natural to conclude that that would tend to prevent it going out into the river. I am of opinion that by taking away the filling behind it, or anything that would tend to thrust it out, it might prevent its going any further out into the river.

780. I presume that in your making the suggestion that the harbour dues might be fixed on a higher scale than those in the schedule to the Bill, you had an idea that the harbour board which you might form, might have similar powers to those of the Limerick Harbour Board, and not only of looking after the harbour, but after the lights, pilotage, and so on?—I would take the whole harbour or port of Ennis from the construction of the Fergus and the Shannon; and I would include the whole of the river and port

Chairman—continued.

under the charge of this harbour board or local authority.

781. And as such a body would give all the additional facilities of protection and buoying and pilotage, and matters of that kind, you think that the persons interested would naturally be willing to pay a higher rate than they otherwise would, just for the use of the pier and the harbour?—Yes, for that reason. It would, in the first place, remove the risk that is at present incurred by vessels, especially foreign vessels, coming up that river, because where they have no system of certificated pilotage they must take anyone who offers himself, on his own word, to take them up this river, with no mark, buoy, or beacon of any kind. Furthermore, it would act in another way; instead of paying dues at Limerick, as many do at present, they would pay dues at Clare Castle only; I am talking now of the interest of the merchants who have to go to Limerick, and who send their grain there and re-ship to Ennis, and pay dues at both ports. Of course, if the dues in Ennis were simply equalled, or if the authority had power to do that, the merchants would not be losers.

783. I suppose you have seen the Bill that is before Parliament?—I have read it.

784. In that Bill power is, of course, given to the Board of Works to prepare a scheme, which scheme would have to be laid before Parliament, and passed in the usual way by a Bill, and it would be possible, in each scheme referring to each pier, to have the scale of charges made suitable to the wants of each district?—Certainly, that is my idea, for the reason that the port of Clare Castle, or Ennis port, or whatever it may be called (I would call it the port of Ennis, because it is simply the port of Ennis), is not in any degree analogous to any of the other ports that are in the River Shannon directly; the port of Clare Castle is 20 miles up a different river, altogether removed from the Shannon. There is one remark that I may make with reference to the quays there, and that is, that in order to provide for deeper water for vessels of heavier tonnage, probably you might have a temporary wooden structure, which would be very cheap, and quite up to the requirements of the port at present; it would not only be economical but less liable to settlement or risk. Of course it would be comparatively temporary.

Mr. Kenny.

785. Is there, in your opinion, any danger of the new pier falling into the bed of the river?—There is a danger of it.

786. It is a constant source of danger in your opinion?—If the present tendency to still shift is not retarded, there will be great danger of its falling into the river.

787. From your observation, you arrive generally at the conclusion that there is a constant source of danger of the new work falling entirely into the bed of the river; are you of that opinion?—I am decidedly of that opinion; it must fall somewhere, and it is just as likely to fall into the river as it is to fall any other way.

788. With regard to two questions of the honourable

1 May 1835.]

Mr. O'CONNELL.

[Continued.]

Mr. Kenny—continued.

honourable Member for Belfast, I would ask you this: whilst there is no objection to wooden foundations in principle, are not the circumstances of

Mr. Kenny—continued.

Clare Castle such as to make it undesirable that a wooden foundation should be adopted there?—
Yes.

Mr. FRANCIS O'CONNOR, called in; and Examined.

Mr. Kenny.

789. You are a Civil Engineer?—Yes.

790. And you know Ennis very well?—Yes.

791. You have had considerable experience, have you not, as an engineer in Ennis, and also in Australia?—Yes.

792. You are a member of the Society of Architects, in London?—Yes.

793. You know Clare Castle Pier, very well, I believe?—Yes.

794. And you are acquainted with its present condition?—Yes.

795. Do you concur in the opinion that has been expressed by Mr. O'Connell, that at the present time this new pier is liable at any moment to fall out into the bed of the river?—Quite so.

796. So that it is a constant source of danger to the navigation of the river?—I am quite certain that if it is not removed, or if something is not done to prop it up, it will fall out.

797. Have you heard Mr. Green's theory of the landslip?—Yes.

798. Do you believe in it?—Not at all.

799. Do you believe that it is a myth?—Altogether, I should think.

800. Do you believe that the movement in the structure is owing to defective foundations?—Altogether. If this landslip occurred, as is stated at the time it did, the tendency of the piles would be to check the landslip. That is the remedy applied always, where there is a landslip, to pile it.

801. And this sudden movement of which Mr. Green spoke in his evidence, is also imaginary on the part of whoever informed him, is it not?—There was no sudden movement of the pier at all; the pier went down gradually. I may state that I held the position of borough engineer and waterworks engineer to the late Town Commissioners. In a sort of semi-official capacity I went to see this pier after it had subsided, and the Town Commissioners passed a resolution calling on the Board of Works to remedy the defects in the pier, or else it would fall out. I examined the pier then, and I found one or two cracks in it which were caused, to my mind, altogether by the insufficient foundation. The piles were not properly driven to my mind, nor were they sufficiently strong.

Chairman.

802. Is it your opinion that the piles were not sufficiently strong?—They are not, in my opinion, nor are they properly driven.

Mr. Kenny.

803. Do you concur in the general views that you have heard Mr. O'Connell express with regard to the condition of the pier?—The condition of the pier is almost as bad as it can be.

O.89.

Mr. Kenny—continued.

804. In your opinion, is it entirely owing to the defective engineering of the Board of Works that the pier is in its present state?—I would not go so far as that. I presume that the design for the pier was a proper one; I should take it that the Board of Works engineer was thoroughly competent to design a pier. I think the real fault was in the construction of the thing; that sufficient care was not taken to have proper piling, and to drive the piles down to a proper depth. If that had been done, I have no doubt whatever, in my mind, that the pier would have lasted.

805. You think that the movement would not have taken place?—I have no doubt that the pier would have lasted; I am equally of opinion that it would be a perfect waste of money to try and repair that pier.

806. And you think that the £2,000 l. additional which it is proposed to spend would be thrown away?—Yes, that is my decided opinion. If that pier is to be repaired, as I understood it is, it will fall down.

807. You have seen the photographs of this place, have you not?—Yes, I saw them a little while ago.

808. Have you seen these buttresses?—Yes.

809. Some of them are placed there permanently, are they not?—Yes. I may explain that when the first fissures and cracks appeared in this pier they excavated the stuff at the back of the pier to try and prevent lateral pressure. I may tell you that after it had been built it appeared to be all right.

810. Will you tell me this, with regard to that point: was the pier opened for traffic without any hitch whatever?—Yes, I think so. It was opened for a short time.

Chairman.

811. Did the pier appear to be all right when it was first opened for traffic?—Yes, it did. I do not know when it was opened for traffic; but when the pier was opened itself it appeared to be all right.

Mr. Kenny.

812. General Sankey, in his report, contradicts that you know; he says: "that when the foundations were being made the land movement was apparent"—I think there seems to be some mistake about it altogether; there have been no excavations at all; it was to obviate the necessity of excavating at that point that piles were driven.

813. Perhaps General Sankey referred to the buttresses that were placed in front to prevent the pier falling out?—No. When the pier first showed that it was sinking, the Board of Works engineer, Mr. Manning, I think, was down there,

E 3

and

1 May 1895.]

Mr. O'CONNOR.

[Continued.]

Mr. Kenny—continued.

and he thou. it to strengthen the pier by piling in front. He took it for granted, I believe, that it was the filling up at the back of the pier that caused the subsidence, and to relieve that they excavated at the back of the pier and they built relieving arches behind on piles and covered the arches over. It was then after that that the great subsidence did take place, and they drove tender piles outside to try and protect the pier from falling in, and they tied those by tie rods; but the whole thing collapsed afterwards.

814. It is your opinion that this subsidence of which people have spoken, is due not to the landslip, but to the fact that the wooden piles underneath gave way?—Yes; that they never went down to a proper foundation. As to the landslip, that is imaginary to my mind.

815. That is your opinion; then of course the statement of Mr. Green, that "it was very providential that the men at work were not killed at the time it occurred," has no foundation in fact?—Pardon me; I think that has reference to another thing; to an accident; what that has reference to would be this, I think; that after they had built these arches they filled up the place, and then when they subsided, that was what caused the stuff at the back to shift and fall down.

816. Then that would be a landslip produced by artificial means?—It would be produced by subsidence in the structure itself.

817. Passing away from the structure, having said enough about its condition, I want to know about the composition of the local harbour board; in the first instance, you think that it would be unjust to saddle Clare Castle Harbour with this debt of 7,000 £?—It would be manifestly unjust to do so, I think.

818. Supposing that this Bill becomes law, what species of harbour board would you be in favour of?—I think I would have a composite board; I would have the importers and exporters, a certain number of them, elected say by the people of Ennis; the sanitary authority, I think, ought to have the election of one or two of its members to represent the board, and I should be decidedly in favour of the grand jury having power to elect one or two members of it.

Mr. O'Shea.

819. If there was a county board you would give it altogether to the county board?—No, I would not; I would give them the same representation as the grand jury or any haroural board.

Mr. Kenny.

820. What do you think of the associated coas-payers of the Barony of Islands?—Really I think they are thoroughly unfit to manage a thing of that sort.

Mr. Lee.

821. To nominate one member?—Yes.

Mr. Kenny.

822. Do you not think, with a board of this character, a certain number of traders, should be placed on the board?—Certainly; I think it would be inadvisable to have the great majority

Mr. Kenny—continued.

of the board importers and exporters, because they could do just as they liked with it.

823. And you would give the grand jury the right to nominate one member, and the sanitary authority the right to nominate one?—Yes, the people are largely interested in it; it is a depot for coal and timber, and I think they ought to have some voice in the matter.

824. Having regard to the representation on such a board, would the traders of Ennis have a vote?—Yes.

825. And you would have these men elected to the board on a restricted franchise?—Yes, more restricted than the present one.

Chairman.

826. Would you exclude any representatives of the local landowners?—The grand jury and the landowners.

827. You would give Lord Inchiquin and Colonel Paterson, the immediate owners, the position of *ex officio* members on the board?—Yes, quite so.

828. And the remainder of the board you would, as far as possible, have comprised of Ennis merchants and traders?—Yes, with the grand jury.

Mr. Corry.

829. Do you not think that the filling up at the back of the work might probably be the cause of the subsidence of the thing in front?—No, it could not; if the foundation had been a proper one all the filling in behind it could not possibly affect it.

830. Have you ever known any instance where that was the case?—Never; and I have had a very large experience in very large works, piling and everything else.

831. Although I am not an engineer, I have seen it take place?—Not if the piling was braced properly.

832. Have you examined the plans of the new pier?—No, I have not; I have never seen them.

833. Then you are giving your opinion without knowing exactly what the plans are of the Board of Works for rebuilding?—From what I have been told by the inspector on the work, what it is proposed to do is, I understand, they are going to build piers about nine feet square; they are, in fact, building them at present in front, 15 feet or 16 feet in front.

Chairman.

834. Are those of wood or stone?—Concrete.

Mr. Kenny.

835. This is the plan, if you will allow me to read it for you: "The other providing for an arrangement of concrete piers at intervals of 12 feet along the entire front, with timber platform above, cost estimated at 1,750 £"; and a little farther down there is an addition to that; General Sankey says, "In making a selection between the two designs for the restoration of the work, I consider that giving full weight to the fact that what is now required is to finally arrest a sliding movement, and either to support the

1 May 1885.]

Mr. O'CONNOR.

[Continued.]

Mr. Kenny—continued.

the existing wall nor counteract pressure from above, the least cost of the two designs may with safety be accepted; but looking to some contingent needs, unnecessary to specify here in detail, I should be disposed to increase the estimate by £50 *l.*, bringing the total to 2,000 *l.* I think that means the erection of some kind of sheeting?—Yes, I take it that according to that the piers built there are to be covered over on the top with sheeting.

Mr. Corry.

836. Supposing that these piers rested on the rock, do you think there would be any chance of their shifting?—I do; I think that if this plan were carried out, it would result in a failure; I have no doubt that the present pier will fall. In point of fact it is getting worse every day, and there is no doubt that if it falls down it will shove out those piers. I think it would be far better, and there is no doubt it would be quite as cheap, to build a new pier higher up the river. You could build a new pier a little higher up the river of the same length as this, and of the same capacity, for certainly 2,000 *l.*

837. Mr. O'Connell suggested that a wooden structure would answer all purposes?—Yes, it would for a time.

838. For 30 years at all events?—Yes, you might either put a wooden structure, or what would be still better, an iron structure with screw piles.

Chairman.

839. That is to say in a new place?—Yes, it should be in a new place.

Mr. CHARLES FREDERICK GREEN, re-called; and further Examined.

Chairman.

847. I THINK that you wish to put in a letter from the Office of Works which bears upon a question that was put to you on Tuesday last, about the lights that were declined to be erected by the Shannon Trust at Clare Castle?—I do. The letter is as follows: "Office of Public Works, Dublin, 8th August 1881. Sir,—In reply to the reference to this Board of the letter addressed by certain merchants and traders interested in Clare Castle Harbour, and the navigation of the River Fergus to Lord Inchiquin, complaining of their neglected state, and also proposing as a remedy for the evils referred to, that the control of the affairs of the Port should be handed over to a local board, which letter was handed in by his Lordship to the Treasury, I am directed to state, for the information of the Lords of Her Majesty's Treasury, that for a general outline of the facts and circumstances connected with the harbour in question, this Board would beg to refer to their letter of the 7th November 1879, and, for the receipts and expenditure to the return made on the order of the House of Commons, dated, Treasury, 21st March 1879 (Parliamentary Paper, 208), as regards the alleged neglected state of the navigation, the Board beg to point out that beyond

0.88.

Mr. Corry.

840. Do you think that the bottom is shifting sand or anything of that kind?—No, it is all alluvial deposit. I do not know the particular site here, but I have examined the river lower down.

841. Are you of opinion that placing a large amount of weight upon the quay would have a tendency to push out the old breastwork?—No, I am not; if it were properly constructed it would not. As a matter of fact just down in that locality I may tell you that there was not a hundred tons of timber at any time. It happened to be there when the timber was piled.

Mr. Synge.

842. From what I have heard of your evidence you agree with Mr. O'Connell?—Yes.

Chairman.

843. Do you agree with Mr. O'Connell with respect to the dues?—I am not competent to form an opinion of these things at all.

Mr. O'Shea.

844. I suppose your estimate of 2,000 *l.* for the new pier higher up is altogether a rough estimate?—No, it is not; I have gone into calculations, and I would have no hesitation in taking a contract to-morrow for the pier for 2,000 *l.*

845. Would you make it a concrete pier, or of what nature?—A still better one, of masonry.

Mr. Corry.

846. Do you think that masonry is better than concrete?—Decidedly.

Chairman—continued.

the maintenance of quays, and the keeping clear the portion of the river bed opposite to them, and which are in good repair, and it is believed was in as good condition now as when completed by the Shannon Commissioners in 1845, they have no jurisdiction or responsibility, nor have they authority to execute works of improvement. The attention of the Board has, however, been called within the past year or two, to the dangers to which vessels navigating the river are exposed from the rock or shoal (called Boorland's Rock) referred to in the merchants' letter, which is situated about $5\frac{1}{2}$ miles below Clare Castle Harbour, and with a view to providing against the danger, they have made propositions, both to the Limerick Harbour Commissioners, who have a certain jurisdiction (as regards pilotage) over the Shannon estuary extending to that of the Fergus, and also to the Irish Lights Board, within whose province, as it appeared to the Board, the duty might be considered to come, to place a beacon on the rock, they (the Board) undertaking to ask the consent of the Treasury, in consideration of the local interests involved, to their contributing towards the work one-half the cost, estimated at 40 *l.* By both boards, however, the proposition has been rejected, and

E 4

1 May 1885.]

Mr. GREEN.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

the rock remains without any warning as to the danger it presents. As regards the rest of the river course, between Clare Castle Pier and the rock in question, the board are not aware of any part requiring dredging or other improvement, but at the present time it is right they should add, they are constructing at the former point an additional length of quayage, as authorised by the Treasury letter of the 15th November 1879, at considerable expense, with a view to providing increased trading facilities with improved quayage in deeper water over a soft bottom, the bottom at the old quay, on which vessels ground, being of hard gravel. The complaints in regard to the board's neglect will therefore be seen from these facts to be unfounded. With regard to the desired transference of the control of the pier and harbour to local authority, the board think such an arrangement deserving of most favourable consideration; and a similar desire having been expressed by Captain O'Shea, A.P., as regards the pier at Kilrush (Cappagh), see Board's letter of 19th February 1881, and Chairman's note of 29th April 1881, to Mr. G. E. Spring Rice, and also more recently as regards Foynes Harbour, they would suggest that inquiries should be made and negotiations entered into with the county and town authorities and those locally interested, with a view to enabling their Lordships to consider the advisability of seeking from Parliament powers to transfer to local authorities the whole of the piers and harbours on the Lower Shannon, seven in number. A map showing the estuary of the River Fergus and the position of Clare Castle Pier, and the Boerland Rock, are sent herewith. I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant, (signed) *E. Hornsby, Secretary.*"

848. I think you wish also to explain what you consider to be a discrepancy in your statement about the weight of the pier having caused the vertical pressure?—In consequence of the honourable Member's remarks this morning, I think there is a little misapprehension as to what I said about the weight of the structure.

849. Will you just read the question and your answer, and give the explanation you wish to make?—At Question 341 I was asked this, "Was the stone structure sufficiently heavy of itself to cause the wooden foundations easily to slip forward?" and my answer was, "No, because the pressure would be vertical; the pressure from the masonry or concrete would be vertically on the top of the piles; there would

Chairman—continued.

be no tendency from the weight of the structure to go forward;" but I did not state that any weight piled at the back of the pier would have no tendency to push it forward, because it decidedly would have such a tendency; that, I think, may explain what appears to be a discrepancy.

Mr. Keay.

850. But this timber was piled on the top of the pier, was it not?—Yes, but the concrete of the pier is immediately over the piles; the timber was placed at the back, and any pressure on the earth at the back would give a lateral pressure; but the weight actually over the piles could give no lateral pressure any more than this table in front of me has a tendency to push the legs forward from any weight that might be put on it.

851. So that the pier was unfit to bear the weight of 300 tons of timber placed on the surface?—Not necessarily; but after a slip has once occurred it is much easier to start a slip again.

852. Evidently those in charge of the harbour were so confident of the stability of the structure that they allowed those 300 tons of timber to rest there for some time?—Yes.

853. And that probably produced the subsidence?—It increased the tendency for it to move forward.

854. So that the pressure really was not vertical from what you say now?—You spoke of the weight of the structure; that is where you appear to have misunderstood me. The heavier the pier is the less likely would it be to move forward from any pressure at the back; in fact if the pier were considerably heavier so much the better.

Mr. Carry.

855. And I suppose that the filling up at the back would have that tendency also?—It would.

Mr. Syme.

856. Whether it was the concrete or whether it was the pressure at the back, was not both done by the Board of Works?—Do you mean that the piling of the timber was the act of the Board of Works?

857. Yes, that is what I meant?—No, it was the cargo that was unloaded.

858. Did not the Board of Works allow it to be there and to lie there?—Certainly.

859. Was not that their act?—I will not say that.

Tuesday, 5th May 1885.

MEMBERS PRESENT :

Mr. Coery.
Mr. Ewart.
Mr. Hibbert.
Mr. Kenny.

Mr. Thomas Lea.
Mr. O'Shea.
Mr. O'Sullivan.
Mr. Syman.

JOHN T. HIBBERT, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. MICHAEL GLYNN, called in; and Examined.

Mr. O'Shea.

Mr. O'Shea.

860. You are a miller, a woollen manufacturer, and merchant in Kilrush?—Yes.

861. And a magistrate for the county?—Yes.

862. And you are well acquainted with Cappa Pier?—I am.

863. What is the state of the pier at the present time?—It is in a very fair state.

864. It was built in three lengths, was it not?—Yes, in three lengths.

865. And if it was extended some 240 feet, would the number of vessels coming there be largely increased?—Very much so.

866. At the present time Cappa Pier is under the management of the Board of Works, is it not?—Yes.

867. I believe there has been considerable complaint as to their management?—Yes.

868. There is complaint, for instance, that undue favouritism is shown to the steamship company?—Yes, certainly.

869. It is said that they have got the monopoly of 150 feet of the best part of the pier?—Precisely so.

Chairman.

870. What steamship company is that?—The Waterford Steamship Company, and any other steamship company that may happen to come, and who is continually plying between Kilrush, Limerick, and Foynes; it is the Waterford Steamship Company principally.

Mr. Syman.

871. Is that the company that has the steamer on the Shannon?—Yes.

872. I thought that was the Limerick Company?—No.

Mr. O'Sullivan.

873. Do you mean the Dublin Steamship Company?—No; the Dublin Steamship Company has nothing to say to the Shannon for the last 15 or 20 years.

Mr. Syman.

874. Is there not a Limerick steamship on the river?—It is called the Limerick steamship; it is not called the Limerick Company, it is called the Lower Shannon Steamship Company, which plies to Waterford.

0.89.

875. Some time ago you wanted to land a cargo of wheat at the pier, did you not?—Yes.

876. And you had to apply for permission to do so at the head office of the Board of Works in Dublin?—Yes.

877. That was in October last?—And on several occasions before that.

878. The answer was that you could not be allowed to do so, as your ship would interfere with the steamer?—Yes, that was it.

879. There is a complaint also of undue favouritism in the rates?—Yes, inasmuch as that, if another steamer came, that is to say, if a steamer outward bound only came to that pier casually, it would have to pay the full rates; it seldom occurs, but it does sometimes occur. I am aware that a steamer taking cattle to Limerick come down to take cattle off that pier, and she had to pay the full rates and charges; the charges were the same on that occasion that any other steamer coming casually there would have to pay; that is three or four years ago.

880. In fact, in the case of this permanent company, the Lower Shannon Navigation Company, their rates are absolutely 50 per cent. lower than what would be charged to any other steamer coming?—Certainly; in the case of those steamers that at present pay, or have been paying for the last 15 or 16 years, their charge is only 1 s., or 1 s. 6 d. at the most, for every time the steamer leaves that pier with a cargo, I may say, of people almost, and goods, for Limerick or Foynes; it is only the same charge coming back again; for instance, I believe one steamer only pays 2 s. a day for the double run, while another steamer pays 3 s. a day for the double run; then, of course, the cargo these steamers carry has also to be paid for, at 1½ d. a ton.

Mr. Syman.

881. Have you read the rates in the Schedule to the Bill?—Yes.

882. Are you satisfied with them?—There is no reference as to the charges.

Mr. O'Shea.

883. Do not you think as a practical man that it would be better, if possible, that a schedule of the rates should be fixed by each public body, or

F

by

5 May 1855.]

Mr. GLYNN.

[Continued.]

Mr. O'Shea—continued.

Mr. Corry.

by the trustees for each separate pier or harbour?—Certainly.

884. The inhabitants of Kilrush are very anxious to get this pier into their own hands, are they not?—Yes.

885. And they have already taken legal steps to establish town commissioners?—Yes, they have.

886. And a radius set down will include the pier?—Yes, it will include the pier.

887. But supposing anything had to be done to this pier before those town commissioners were appointed, the inhabitants would like to see the pier vested in trustees?—Yes.

888. If that were done would they wish to see the pier vested in trustees chosen from the trading classes, the commercial classes of the place?—Certainly.

889. Would such a body of trustees as the following be satisfactory to the inhabitants: Dr. Dinan, Mr. Culligan, Mr. Madigan, Mr. G. Doherty, and Mr. Glynn?—Yes, and Mr. J. C. Mahony.

890. The traders amongst them, and merchants amongst them, are all solvent men, are they?—Yes; all quite solvent.

891. And they are deeply interested in the pier?—They are all equally interested in the pier; they are quite solvent and equally interested in the pier.

Chairman.

892. You stated that the inhabitants would like the pier to be vested in trustees chosen from the trading classes?—Yes.

893. Would they approve of any of the principal landowners being trustees?—No; Mr. Doherty is a landed proprietor, but his land does not touch the Kilrush Pier.

Mr. Lea.

894. I merely wish to ask one question. You are desirous that the trustees should be named in the Bill or by the Board of Works; you wish that the names of the trustees should be settled by Parliament or by the Board of Works?—It is immaterial where it is so long as they are named.

895. Do you speak for any meeting or body?—Yes; we had a meeting; a large meeting.

896. And you were authorised at that meeting to represent them here?—Yes.

Mr. O'Sullivan.

897. Do you think that the people of Kilrush would object to have a representative or two from the board of guardians of Kilrush on the board?—They would have no objection at all.

898. Would they have any objection to a man having great property having one representative on the board; would there be any objection to one representative from people of property on the board of Kilrush?—I am not aware, and could not answer that. You might select one or two guardians if you liked.

899. Would you give power to the board of guardians to select one or two representatives?—Yes; I would not object to that.

900. I presume that your objection to the steamship company that is regularly trading there, having a preference in duce, is that it gives them practically a monopoly of the trade?—No doubt whatever of that; they have the exclusive right to that; they are allowed to have it by the Board of Works, and have had it for many years. On several occasions the people of Kilrush looked for accommodation to discharge vessels where the steamer came to, and they were refused.

901. Do you think that if the harbour pier were under the control of a local board, that monopoly would be done away with?—I think it would. I think the trustees, for their own interests and for the interests of the pier, would do everything in their power to facilitate their steamers, and to show no undue interference such as arises now. There may be some cases where a steamer would not suffer by a sailing ship or another steamer coming for a day or two, or half a day; such things are not allowed now; but if the pier was vested in trustees, such a thing would not be any detriment to the steamboat interests, and might be allowed.

901.* With regard to the cargo of grain which you referred to, which you applied to land there, was that from Limerick, or where was it from?—It was a cargo of Australian wheat shipped from the Port of Victoria in Australia, and bought by me at Queenstown, the port of call.

902. It would have been a great convenience to you, undoubtedly, if you had been permitted to discharge the cargo there?—Yes.

903. Would the ship have come to the pier without extra cost?—She would have come into the pier without extra cost.

904. Where had you to discharge that cargo in consequence?—Afloat; and when we had about half out, we brought her up to the pier, but we could not touch the steamboat pier, but had to go to the upper end of the pier where the water is about 162 feet in depth.

905. Is the water deeper there than in the other places?—Yes, than farther up.

906. Could not the other part of the pier be dredged to give accommodation for ships coming up there?—It could not for those vessels; this vessel is allowed to draw 18 feet of water, and we are bound to discharge this vessel while afloat. Then if you are to dredge that pier, it would be no sooner dredged than it would fill up again.

907. Then supposing that steamboat berth had been available, could you have discharged it afloat at that particular place?—Yes, if there was an extension of the pier; but not otherwise.

908. So that that clause in your charter party prevented you, under any circumstances, from discharging at the pier?—Unless with the toleration of the captain. The clause in the charter party stands good in favour of the ships being discharged afloat; but the captain, if he sees it fit, can do it.

909. He will do it for a consideration?—Yes, for a very little consideration, if any. I have known them to come in there voluntarily, get their crew in a boat, and go along the pier and take soundings to see if there is a substance there, to save the ship from injury, and then they come there.

910. Are

5 May 1885.]

Mr. GLYNN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Corry—continued.

Mr. Synan—continued.

910. Are you aware that it is the usual practice in harbours for regular steamers to have particular berths allotted to them?—I suppose so. I cannot say anything against that.

911. So that the local authority which you expect to be formed would very likely do the same as the Board of Works?—They would give every facility for those steamers to come, and would give them every right they could expect.

912. What is the difference in the rates between the Limerick steamer and your vessel, for instance, coming in accidentally?—If a steamer comes in, as I tell you, she has to pay a small charge every day; but if my ship comes to the pier the vessel would have to pay 5*s.* a ton on the registered tonnage, and on the discharging of the cargo it would have to pay 1*s.* a ton, which would make a difference in favour of the earnings of the pier of 6½*s.* a ton.

913. And you think that is a prohibition rate?—Yes, a prohibition rate, and so much that a vessel cannot come there.

914. You tell me that she cannot come for want of water?—No; unless the captain consents to bring her in, as he might do, because it is a safer berth; in fact, when the tide is out she is as safe as when the tide is in.

915. What I want to arrive at is, what, in your opinion, the difference would be in the action of a local body having charge of this pier, and the Board of Works that now exercises the authority?—I could very easily answer that; that the local body to whom the pier would be entrusted might allow a vessel to come to that pier, and that the discharging of her might not occupy more than six days, and I do not think it would occupy a day or two, and sometimes (I think the vessel would pay about 20*l.* quay dues both on the cargo and tonnage of the vessel; it would be more or less about that), when the steamer has the exclusive right to that part of the pier for the six days, would not have a pound to pay, and both those things could be counted without injury to either party; that would be a great thing for the pier trustees, and perhaps for the shipping as well.

916. From your local knowledge do you think it possible to combine those two things, a daily steamer and a casual ship coming in?—I do think it would be very easy to combine them; and if you refer to the letter on the table from the Board of Works it will explain that the reason why I was refused permission for my vessel to come to that pier was that putting pigs or cattle on board might interfere with the steamboat rights; whereas, they having a crane on the pier, if those things were put first into the deck of the vessel alongside the pier, there would be no difficulty in putting them on board the steamer alongside the vessel, whether they were cattle or pigs. That letter shows that is the reason I got, as an apology, from the Board of Works why they would not allow it.

Mr. Synan.

917. What is the depth of water in the deepest part of the pier, where the steamers anchor?—At low water there is nine feet.

0.89.

918. What is the depth at high water?—At high-water, at that part of the pier, I should say it was nearly 20 feet.

919. Is that at the extremity of the pier?—Yes.

920. They have the deepest part?—Yes.

921. And if they lay too long, and another vessel comes in, I suppose the water would be too shallow for a heavy vessel?—As the vessel came in there would be less water there than at low water.

922. Would there be enough water at high water to discharge her cargo inside of the steamer?—A vessel drawing 17 feet of water might come in at high water spring tides; but then when the tide went out there would not be a drop under her.

923. What is the depth at low water between the steamer and the land?—Little or none; between two or three feet at the upper part, which the steamer occupies when the tide is out. I suppose not more than two or three or four feet of water, that is at the upper part, next the shore.

924. In that part of the shore, what would be the depth at high water?—I suppose there might be 12 or 13 feet.

925. Inside the steamer, that is between the steamer and the land?—Twelve or 13 feet at high-water at that part of the pier.

926. Have you read the schedule of rates in this Bill?—Yes, I have.

927. That schedule of rates will apply to all vessels, whether steamers or others, according to their tonnage?—Yes.

928. Do you object to them?—No.

929. Do you think them right?—We have no objection to the scale of charges, but we object to the rates paid by steamers that have exclusive right to that part of the pier, and we object to the charges they pay.

930. You think that the Board of Works entered into a contract with the steamers by giving them such facilities?—Yes.

931. Will you tell the Committee what representative body you suggest; I am not talking of individuals; but how do you propose to give us a representative body to whom to transfer this pier?—I would say those who are exporters and importers, living for 10 years in town.

932. The exporters and importers would elect members to represent them; is that so, is that what you propose?—No, it is not; as trustees they would have the management.

933. Have you any objection to have the exporters and importers of goods electorally represented on that local board?—No.

934. Do you propose to have town commissioners appointed soon?—Yes, very soon.

935. Have you any objection that they should have members to represent them on the board?—I have no objection to that.

936. Would there be any objection that the board of guardians, who are in existence now, should elect one or two persons to represent them on the board?—There would be no objection to one or two members; but we object to the whole being vested in the board of guardians exclusively.

Y 2

937. I do

5 May 1885.]

Mr. GLYNN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Syme—continued.

937. I do not propose that; I want an elective body; you think that those three bodies would elect a representative body sufficient to guard the interests of Kilrush?—Yes, I do.

938. You do not want the proprietors?—No.

939. Who is the proprietor of the soil?—Mr. Vandeleur, Colonel Vandeleur's son.

940. He has the land down to low water, I presume?—Yes, he has.

Mr. Kenny.

941. You say that the Lower Shannon Steam Packet Company have an unfair advantage?—So far as the lower part of the pier is concerned.

942. But with regard to the scale of tolls, and with regard to the amount of pier allotted to them?—Precisely so.

943. As a matter of equity, would you think it would be fair to charge steamers coming to the pier every second day the same rate that you would charge a vessel calling only two or three times a year?—Steamers come there every day.

944. But would you think it fair to charge those steamers belonging to the Steam Packet Company that call every day, the same rate for quays as you would charge an ocean-going vessel calling two or three times a year?—I am quite clear on that; of course we would not; we would increase their charges but very little. An ocean-going steamer would have to pay 20 per cent. more.

945. You are aware, I suppose, that the advantages and privileges, as you might call them, which the Steam Packet Company enjoy, are only what are provided in the second scale of charges in the Schedule; you have read the Schedule?—I was looking at it, and if I do not mistake, I did not see such a charge as 1s. or 2s. a day for the use of that steamer coming to and from the pier.

946. There is a charge here of 3s. for vessels of 100 tons and upwards for the first week, and a 1s. a week afterwards?—It would admit of correction, I think.

947. Are you in favour of raising that?—I would be in favour of making that charge more than twice as much; I would put 6s. a day on this steamer instead of 2s.

948. Instead of 3s.; and you would put on 3s. instead of 1s. 6d.?—Yes, I would.

949. You said that the Steam Packet Company's steamers enjoy a monopoly of a portion of the quay?—Yes.

950. Do you think that the quay space is really enough at Cappa Pier for the custom of Kilrush?—No.

951. I suppose you are aware of that proposal which was made, three or four years ago, to extend the Cappa Pier?—Yes, I was very much mixed up with it.

952. To extend it 160 feet, at a cost of 8,000l.?—Yes, I think that was too much.

953. Do you know why the Board of Works failed to go on with the thing?—I will tell you the reasons. The reason I got was, because they wanted to invest the whole in a local body, which

Mr. Kenny—continued.

we had not then, but which we are likely to have in a few days.

954. Did they defer this thing for the purpose of constituting a local harbour board for the purpose of carrying on the scheme?—They did not put it that way; but they said that if we had a representative body in Kilrush, they would invest the pier in it; we had not a representative body, and therefore the thing fell to the ground, and it has not been done since then.

955. Are you aware that the Shannon Trust have received a profit from Cappa Pier, since its construction, of over 2,000l.?—I was not aware of that.

956. If I tell you, upon the statement of the engineer to the Board of Works, that they have received a profit of over 2,000l., do you think that the new authority would be entitled to claim that 2,000l.?—I do think they would. What I think is this, that they would look to get that 2,000l. if the pier were now to be invested in them; they would be disposed to take up the pier as it stands, and bind themselves for the maintenance of the pier.

957. You expect the town commissioners board will be established in Kilrush very soon?—I have no doubt of it.

958. Do you think that the town commissioners would be quite a competent body to take charge of the Cappa Pier?—Yes, I think so.

959. Entirely, without any addition to the board?—They have no need for any addition.

960. It would be representative of the people of Kilrush?—Yes, I should say that we would have eight or ten or a dozen people constituting the town commissioners.

961. But if the town commissioners were established, you would object, would you not, to having added to the body controlling the harbour any persons from the board of guardians?—We would object to parties from the board of guardians.

962-3. You would not object to having two persons nominated by the board of guardians to rank with them?—There would be no objection to that.

964. Is that the opinion of the people of Kilrush?—I am sure there will not be a dissenting voice; I do not think there would, at all events; I do not see why there should.

Chairman.

965. You say that you are dissatisfied, and I presume that other inhabitants of the district are dissatisfied, with the privileges given to this steamship company?—Yes.

966. Have you ever made any representation to the Board of Works as to this grievance?—Yes, we have.

967. And have you never had any satisfaction?—We have never had any satisfactory reply, any more than what I stated; that they said that if we had a representative body they would vest the pier in it, and, if I do not mistake, they were inclined to extend the pier.

968. Did they refuse to take any steps to change the system in operation?—That was the request, but they did not agree to it. We got a large memorial, signed, I think, with 300 or 400 respectable

5 May 1885.]

Mr. GLYNN.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

respectable manner upon it, and sent forward to the Board of Works some five years ago. I was the party most mixed up in it; we put it through Mr. O'Shea, and he took the entire management of it at the time; yet, as there was not a representative body, it fell through, and has not been brought before any body since then.

969. Have you had to complain often of the want of space for vessels of yours when they have arrived?—Yes; in fact it is depth of water that we want for our vessels; the pier would be long enough, but there is no water where the pier is.

970. I fancied that your complaint is quite as much, or perhaps more, against the privileges given to this steamship company as to space, rather than as to the lower duties they are charged; am I right in that?—No.

971. You complain of both?—We complain of both; we do not complain so much of the charges that the steamship company have to pay, as that they have an exclusive right to the exclusion of any local person coming near them.

972. That is what I fancied you meant, and that is what made me ask you that question. I suppose your opinion is that if this pier were vested in a local body they would be able to deal with this matter more satisfactorily?—Certainly, why not; they would do all in their power to accommodate their steamers, and it should not be said they could not go beyond the schedule of charges, only we think that the schedule of charges, as applied to this steamer, is too little. If we get the pier we would like to make it pay.

973. Are you aware whether the principal lord of the soil, Captain Vandeleur, has at any time found or spent any money upon this pier?—I heard that his father gave a grant towards the pier years ago.

974. When it was first made?—Yes.

975. Do you know at all what his opinion is with respect to the formation of a local authority?—I cannot say.

976. You are not aware whether he himself would wish to be represented upon it?—I am not aware whether he would, or not; he is away from us for some time. I know very well that there was not a man more anxious than he was for the extension of the pier; he always gave us all the help he could towards the extension of the pier; but how he would feel now if he was put in as a trustee, I could not say; I do not know whether he would be disposed to act as a trustee, or not.

Mr. O'Shea.] I am authorized to say that Mr. Vandeleur, as lord of the soil, has no

Chairman—continued.

objection to the pier being vested in the town commissioners.

Mr. Keay.

977. I wish to ask you another question; do you think that the river bed opposite Cappa Pier requires dredging?—No.

978. And, therefore, the depth of the water could not be improved there by any artificial means?—No; not as the present pier stands. But, I would like to add a word with regard to that. There is a site immediately opposite the pier; I took soundings across it a couple of years ago to know the depth of water; and when you get about 14 feet out from the point of the present pier, you get into a depth of water of 20 feet at low water; it is one of the best foundations that can be got for the pier anywhere there. That pier has been there 40 years now, and there is not a rent in it, only a little of the face that requires an outlay of about 60 l. or 60 l. at the upper end. That being so, if that pier were extended 200 to 250 feet at low water, at the lowest tide there would be 21 feet of water for any vessel going in or out of the Shannon. Vessels I know very well of my own knowledge on Scatterry Roads cannot get out; but if they had sufficient water to come there, they would come, and other vessels besides. There are vessels that do not come into the Shannon at all which if they thought there was deep water would come in distress very frequently. I am the agent for Lloyd's down there, and these things come under my knowledge frequently. I am aware that a vessel came there last winter, and the captain had to come ashore from Scatterry Roads and bring men to shift the cargo; he had to take the iron out of her deck and get it re-stowed again; whereas with a deep-water pier at Cappa, that vessel would come in and get her works done and pay her dues, and serve the port.

Mr. Sykes.

979. Do you propose to extend the pier 240 feet towards the Scatterry Roads?—Towards Hog Island, in the direction of Scatterry Roads.

980. Would that interfere with the navigation of the river?—Not a bit.

981. Would it not narrow the navigation?—There would be any amount of space outside, between that and Hog Island.

Mr. O'Sullivan.

982. Would that be deep water?—Yes, for a considerable distance outside that; there would be no difficulty at all.

The Right Honourable Lord MONTEAGLE; Examined.

Chairman.

Chairman—continued.

983. You are the owner of all the land within a mile of the harbour of Foynes?—Yes, I think I may say safely within a mile.

984. Did your predecessor, I think it was your grandfather, contribute towards the construction

of the pier?—Yes, I think the amount has been stated by Mr. Green.

985. Was that the largest amount that was contributed; there was no amount contributed by the district, I think?—No.

988. Then

x 3

5 May 1885.]

The Right Hon. Lord MONTAGUE.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

Chairman—continued.

986. Then that was the only amount?—Yes, I believe that the contribution made by my grandfather was the largest contribution by any proprietor on the Shannon towards the works under the Shannon Navigation Act of 1839.

987. And after the formation of the pier, did your predecessor take the management of the pier in any way?—No; my grandfather, I believe, surrendered all his rights, whatever they might have been, in the foreshore and otherwise, and had no control either over the construction of the works or of the management of the harbour after the works were completed.

Mr. Synge.

988. He surrendered his rights to the Board of Works?—Yes.

Chairman.

989. Was any condition made to him by the Board of Works when they took over the pier?—I am not aware that there was any condition in writing; but I have always understood that what Mr. Green stated was the general line of the agreement; that 10 feet, at low-water spring tides, was to be given by the Board of Works.

990. And, I presume, that that, from the evidence we have heard, has not been given; at least, not of late years?—Not continuously; it may have been given when the works were first completed and the dredging carried out; but it cannot have been there many days after the dredging stopped.

991. Has the pier returned any benefit to you or to your property?—No; I do not think it has ever been considered to have been of the smallest benefit either to my predecessors or myself; whatever benefit the place has derived has been from the railway.

992. Of course you have seen the Bill which is brought into the House of Commons, proposing to deal with the various piers upon the Shannon?—I have.

993. And you understand that a scheme will be prepared by the Board of Works for transferring the several piers to proper authorities?—Yes.

994. Have you any suggestion to make with respect to the proper authority in which this pier of Foynes should be vested?—That is rather a difficult question, I think. I have naturally considered it a great deal; my interest as the landowner is, of course, to have the place developed by somebody competent and willing to do so; and I should be delighted if any local authority, such as is contemplated in one clause of the Bill, could be found to carry those improvements into effect.

995. Have you yourself made any claim or application to have this pier transferred to you?—I have never made any claim to the Board of Works to have it transferred to me. Various representations have been made to the Board of Works from time to time, asking them to do something to extend the harbour, or to make it available for traffic. I may state in further answer to your question, that I am not prepared to suggest any local authority that would be fit to take it over. I do not think that the county

could well be asked to take it over, for this reason: that nothing really effective, I think, could be done at Foynes without considerable expenditure, and I think that the county authority could hardly be expected to enter on such a speculative enterprise as that would be. The other authorities that are contemplated by the Bill, I think, are the sanitary authority, that is to say the board of guardians, to whom the same remark would apply in a greater degree. I do not remember at this moment, because I have not the Bill before me, but I do not think there is any other authority contemplated, except local authorities.

996. Local authorities or trustees?—Yes, but I was speaking at that moment of local authorities; that is to say, public bodies that are now in existence, or that might be created, and the only other body, as far as I remember, that is contemplated in the Bill is the body of the town commissioners, and there is no possibility of any such being formed at Foynes at the present time. Foynes consists of a railway station, a police barrack, a post office, and a hotel.

Mr. Synge.

997. The Bill provides that it shall become the property of the local body; it may be vested in a trustee, but it must become the property of the local body, whatever the local body is; it cannot be the property of the trustees?—Yes, that is certainly quite clear; I do not understand what the Chairman said; he said the county trustees.

Chairman.

998. As I understand you, your opinion is that Foynes should become, if properly developed, a commercial harbour?—Yes.

999. Do you think that if Foynes was vested in yourself, as the principal landowner, you would be able or willing to develop it in the way in which it ought to be developed?—It is a very serious responsibility for a poor Irish landlord to undertake; but falling any local authority, such as is contemplated in the Bill, which would be able and willing to develop it (that as I have indicated being the course I should naturally prefer, which would relieve me of the responsibility), failing such an authority I should be willing to accept a transfer of the harbour under the section to which the honourable Member has alluded, as the trustee for the public, and to expend money myself in developing it.

1000. Have you at all made any calculation as to what sum will be necessary to develop the harbour in a proper way?—I have taken the advice of engineers, and I have formed the opinion that it would cost about 5,000 £ to give accommodation to ocean-going steamers at all times of the tide.

1001. Do you wish to say anything further upon the point of the development of the harbour?—Nothing occurs to me just now.

Mr. Synge.

1002. Does your engineering authority, whom you consulted, inform you how the 5,000 £ was to be expended?—Yes.

1003. How

5 May 1885.]

The Right Hon. Lord MONTEAGLE.

[Continued.]

Mr. Sykes—continued.

Chairman—continued.

1003. How was it to be expended?—In an extension of the pier into deep water, with a T-head such as was mentioned by Mr. Green the other day. I believe that all the engineering authorities of the day agree that that is the best way to utilise the pier in the first instance. It was first suggested in a Committee that sat on the Western Harbours of Ireland about the year 1851, and has been recommended since that time by Mr. Forsyth, and more lately by the railway company, and, I think, by the harbour engineer of Limerick.

Chairman.

1004. Would a portion of that amount be expended in dredging the harbour?—It did not contemplate any dredging at all. I may mention that Mr. Green in his evidence was asked by the honourable Member for county Limerick, I think, what Mr. Manning had estimated the cost of dredging at. I happen to have an extract from Mr. Manning's report with regard to that, in which he estimated the cost of dredging; that was in the year 1872, when the conditions were very similar to what they now are. In order to accommodate the largest vessels now frequenting the port, and to enable it to enter and to leave the port at high water of neap tides, the estimated cost was 1,900 £. That is the initial cost of dredging it out, and in order to maintain it, he estimated an annual expenditure of 60 £ a year in round numbers. That would represent a capital of 3,000 £, and that would only give accommodation to the vessels now frequenting the port, and they would have to lay on the mud at low water, which would effectually, I believe, prevent any steamer coming there.

1005. I suppose you are of opinion that neither the grand jury nor the board of guardians would be authorities who would be likely to spend large sums of money in developing and maintaining the harbour?—I should hardly think it would ever be proposed to the ratepayers to sanction such an expenditure; it could only be done under the Bill, as I understand it, by a local authority on the security of the rates, which would, of course, be a large responsibility for the ratepayers.

1006. I suppose you have heard that a proposal has been met by the Limerick Harbour Board that they should have this pier vested in them?—It has not been communicated to me in any official way, but I have heard it stated.

1007. What distance is Foynes from Limerick?—It is about 25 miles by road, but I do not know what the exact measurement is by river.

1008. What is your own opinion with respect to the transfer to such a body as the Limerick Harbour Board?—I do not think it would be desirable either in the interest of the public or in my own interest.

1009. What is your reason for saying that?—If anything is to be made of Foynes as a commercial harbour, and if it is to accommodate ocean-going steamers, it appears to me that it would inevitably enter into competition with Limerick; and the practice of Parliament, and the general custom as to the general public policy pursued, I think has always been opposed to vesting any independent harbour of that kind in the hands of a rival.

O.B.B.

1010. Your view is that they might starve the place and prevent its development?—I would not say that they would starve it in the sense that they would try to diminish the traffic that now comes there; I have no doubt if they took it over, if such a proposal received the sanction of Government and of Parliament, some security would be taken there for spending some money there in developing the place; but I do not think that any adequate guarantee could be afforded of their endeavouring to attract traffic, or to adapt themselves to the needs of a growing port like that at a considerable distance from their own centre.

1011. I understand; is it not a fact that the Limerick Harbour Board have some rights over the river between Limerick and Foynes, with respect to pilotage and lights?—I think they have no power with respect to lights; but they have as to pilotage the right, I think, under their Act, of managing the pilotage of the river; I think that they have nothing to do with the maintenance of the channel in any way, nor with the buoying of the channel below Beagh Castle, some eight or 10 miles above Foynes.

1012. Then there is another body interested in Foynes, namely, the Waterford and Limerick Railway Company. Are they a likely body to take part in the development of Foynes Harbour?—It would appear to be their interest to develop the harbour; but I have not heard of their making any move in that direction; and I should hardly fancy that their finances are in such a position as to admit of their undertaking such a novel enterprise; I believe, moreover, that Parliament and the Board of Trade are rather opposed to the policy of vesting harbours in railway companies.

1013. Would it not be possible to have some joint board, a board representing the Limerick Harbour Trustees, and representing yourself, as the principal landowner, and a representative of the railway company?—I do not think that such an arrangement would be likely to work very well; I do not see how they could raise the money for carrying out the works.

1014. The Bill would give authority to raise the money, would it not?—Yes; but I do not see what security they could offer. The Bill only enables trustees to raise money on the security of the harbour dues; the harbour dues at Foynes are at present a mere bagatelle, and it would be a mere matter of speculation what they would realise in the event of extension.

1015. But still the harbour dues would increase largely?—Yes, I believe they would, but that might be considered a matter of speculation by the Board of Works, or whoever the lending authority was.

1016. With respect to your own proposal, that the pier should be transferred to yourself, as the principal landowner, would it not be rather contrary to the general tendency, to vesting a public undertaking in the hands of one person?—I think it has been done in one case in Ireland.

1017. What case do you refer to?—The Courtown Harbour was handed over to Lord Courtown, in the county of Wexford.

P 4

1018. Is

5 May 1885.]

The Right Hon. Lord MONTEAGLE.

[Continued.]

Mr. Kenny.

1018. Is that on the sea coast, or on the river?—I imagine it is on the sea coast, but I have never been there.

Chairman.

1019. Was that done by Act of Parliament, or was it transferred from the Board of Works?—It was transferred from the Board of Works, I think, by Act of Parliament. I suppose there must have been some legislation on the subject. I have no desire to have the harbour transferred to me, except for the purpose of developing it. I should be much better pleased if somebody else would do it; but it appears to me that if it were transferred to me under the provisions of the Bill, it would be quite impossible for me, as a private individual, either to make any profit out of the harbour, or to convert it to my own use in any way, or to work it in any way, except in such a way as would be a benefit for the public.

1020. As I understand it, it would not be your object, if it was transferred to you solely, merely to take it as a matter of profit; your wish would be to develop it for the good of the district?—Yes. I regard my interest as the landowner in the surrounding lands as being practically identical with the interests of the public. I cannot do anything to improve it, or to bring business there, without benefiting the public before I benefit myself.

1021. As I understand it, you would object to the Limerick Harbour Board, or the representatives of the Limerick Harbour Board, having any control in the harbour at all?—Yes.

1022. Even with a joint representation with some other body?—Yes. I should not like to see the harbour authority of Limerick have any control over Foynes. I think, that if they were to have it at all, it would be better that they should have it altogether. I think a divided authority would be the worst thing possible.

1023. Supposing that it was transferred to the Limerick Harbour Board, I presume there would be a sufficient control by the Board of Works to provide against any abuse by that authority, that is to say, by the Harbour Board, against any neglect of duty?—I should not like to commit myself to an opinion on that question. I should think that if the Board of Trade were asked they would say that it was very difficult to enforce provisions of that kind for ensuring particular action on the part of a public body in the position of a harbour authority.

1024. Do you approve generally of the principle of the Bill with respect to the transfer of these piers?—I think it is desirable in the public interest that they should be transferred to local bodies or persons.

1025. I think you were present when Mr. Green gave his evidence?—Yes.

1026. You heard that he contemplated several of the smaller piers being transferred to the counties?—Yes.

1027. And the piers at Foynes, Clare Castle, and Kilrush, either to local authorities or to trustees?—Yes; I think Mr. Green used the words local authorities, and I understood him to mean, in contradistinction to the county authority, that he did not mean to exclude trustees.

1028. The Bill, of course, gives authority to

Chairman—continued.

transfer the piers either to trustees or to local authorities, or to local bodies?—Yes, exactly.

1029. Have you any suggestion to make for the improvement of the Bill beyond the mere fact of the question of the transfer?—On the question of transfer, it appeared to me that it ought to be made clearer, in the clause empowering the Board of Works to transfer by Order the harbour to a local authority, that the Board of Works was not to have power to thrust it upon a local authority whether they wished it or not.

1030. I think it is with their assent; the word "willing" is used?—I have not a copy of the Bill, but I was under the impression that the Board of Works had the power to thrust it on them. The word "willing," I think, is introduced in the Trustee Clause, but not in the other.

Mr. Synn.

1031. You are right; the word "willing" is introduced into the Trustee Clause, and is not introduced into the Local Authority Clause?—It appeared to me that it ought to be introduced into the other clause.

Chairman.

1032. I suppose you are aware that it is not to be done by order of the Board of Works; it must be done by a scheme to be laid before Parliament, and therefore the local authority would have full power to object and to bring their case before Parliament, supposing they did object?—Yes, supposing that Parliament had time to attend to them. Before you pass from that, you asked me whether I had any suggestion to make with regard to points of detail about the Bill. There are one or two things that occur to me. There is a power given to the harbour authority to borrow on the security of the harbour dues; there is also a power given to the Board of Works to lend on that security. Under another clause, I forget which clause it is, there is power given to the harbour authority, where it is a local authority, to borrow on the security of the rates.

Chairman.

1033. On collateral security?—Yes, on the collateral security; and there is a corresponding power to the Board of Works to lend on collateral security. But in the case of trustees there is no power in them to borrow except on the security of the harbour dues, which might be very insufficient, as I pointed out just now, to give any adequate security at all. It appeared therefore to me that in the case of trustees, a similar power should be given to the Board of Works to lend on collateral security, approved by the Treasury, in order to put a body of trustees on a similar footing.

1034. In such cases you mean where a local authority is willing to join in giving a security?—I did not mean that the trustees should have power to borrow on the security of the rates, but on some collateral security (it might be the security of adjacent lands, or otherwise), to be approved of, of course, by the Treasury. Then there is another point which has been suggested.

It

5 May 1885.]

The Right Hon. Lord MONTEAGLE.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

It was suggested in the resolution of the Limerick grand jury, which has been alluded to by the honourable Member, which I believe has been presented as a petition to the House, that the Board of Works should be bound to put the harbours in a proper state of repair before handing them over; I think that some provision of that kind might fairly be inserted in the Bill. The only other point that occurred to me was that the Board of Trade should be the Government Department under whom these harbour authorities should be, and to whom they should report, instead of the Board of Works and the Treasury. It seems to me that it would be better to have it under a Government Department specially charged with that business, and which is provided with all the staff necessary.

1035. You prefer that they should report to the Board of Trade, in London, rather than to the Board of Works in Ireland?—Yes, I think that would be better. There is a double reference in the Bill; first, the Board of Works have a kind of control, and then the Treasury have a kind of control over them again. Of course, in all matters of finance the Treasury ought to have control over these matters so far as lending powers, and so forth, are concerned; but in strictly harbour questions of harbour management, it seems to me to be better that it should be under the Board of Trade.

1036. I suppose you are aware that, even if it was placed under the management of the Board of Trade, still the question of making loans would be under the control of the Treasury?—Yes, that is what I meant.

1037. Have you anything to say with respect to the schedule of charges for the use of the piers?—I have not very particularly considered the charges; they are very low.

1038. Would you think it desirable that in the transfer of each pier special rates should be placed in the scheme which refers to the several piers?—Yes, I think that would be desirable.

1039. Instead of having one general system of rates placed in the general schedule of the Bill, that each scheme should deal with the rates of its own pier?—Yes, quite so; I think the policy usually adopted by Parliament in Committees of both Houses is that the schedule is arranged with reference to the facilities afforded for traffic and the shipping which they could accommodate, which would of course differ in the different cases.

Mr. Swan.

1040. Would you give power to the local body to alter the rates according to circumstances?—Within limits fixed by Parliament, I would. There is, of course, as the Committee will be aware, a clause, I think, not only authorising but forcing the harbour authorities to reduce the dues where they have a profit, where the receipts exceed the expenditure, and every harbour authority must have power to adjust their dues within limits.

1041. I suppose you are aware, from evidence which has been given, that the receipts of Foynes have been very much less than the expenditure, not only during the last five years, but also during the whole time since the pier has been

0.89.

Mr. Swan—continued.

completed?—Yes, in consequence of the very large expenditure on dredging, which I regard as so much money thrown away.

1042. You do not approve of dredging?—No, I entirely disapprove of it.

1043. Then, supposing that you had a bank of mud close to the pier, how would you get rid of the mud?—I should leave the mud there and go outside it.

1044. By extending the pier?—By extending the pier.

1045. Would it be in the T form that you mentioned?—Yes.

1046. That would be part of the expenditure which you propose to make upon the pier, supposing that it was vested in your hands?—Yes; with reference to that expenditure upon dredging, I wish to have an opportunity just to show the charts to the Committee. This (producing a chart) is a chart of the year 1841, at least it is copied from a chart of that year, and that was just at the time when that harbour was being completed. I think the works were nearly completed at the time; I think the works must have been carried out, but not the dredging (*the Witness laid the chart before the Committee, and described it to them*). Referring to Mr. Green's evidence, he said that there was no silting at the end of the pier, but that he had not taken soundings. From what I knew they were doing, I felt sure that there was silting. I have made inquiries since Mr. Green gave his evidence, and I find that there has been a deposit of silt outside the end of the pier to a foot or two since the dredging was done three years ago, so that silting is going on even now rapidly at the end of the pier. There is a bank of mud there, and it suddenly goes down that line there (*describing it*).

Chairman.

1047. I do not know whether I have a right to ask whether you have had any communication with the Limerick Harbour Board upon this subject?—No, I have not.

1048. Is there anything else that you wish to state to the Committee?—I do not know that I have anything further to state.

1049. What is your opinion about the state of repair of the pier at the present time?—The state of repair of the present structure is rather an engineering question. Mr. Green stated what every one who has been there must have observed, that there have been one or two settlements, but they are of old standing, as he stated, and I do not fancy that there is much danger of their going further.

Mr. O'Shea.

1050. I think you take a great interest in establishing a local self-government in Ireland?—Yes.

1051. In your scheme is there no possible body to which such works as Foynes Harbour would have to be given over under a general scheme of self-government?—I can quite imagine that in some cases the local bodies, such as, for instance, the new county authority to be created, might be a very fit and proper depository for such powers and responsibilities; but when I consider the expenditure which has to be undertaken in this case, I do not think that such a

G

body

5 May 1885.]

The Right Hon. Lord MONTEAGLE.

[Continued.]

Mr. O'Shea—continued.

body would be able to undertake it, and I should doubt very much indeed whether they would be willing to do so.

1052. You do not think that the county boards will take over any works on which there is an expenditure to be made?—I should not think they would, where there was a large expenditure contemplated. If it were a question of fishery piers as a part of an Imperial policy being erected by public grants, and which you would have to transfer to somebody who would look after them, I think that the county authority would be an excellent authority for the purpose. But when it is contemplated to make a commercial harbour, or where facilities for such appear to exist, with railway accommodation and all that kind of thing, I do not think the county authority would have any staff suitable for the purpose.

Mr. Lea.

1053. May I ask your Lordship how far Foyens is up the river?—From the mouth of the river it is about 40 miles; I suppose 30 or 40 miles.

1054. Do I rightly understand that your grandfather gave a grant of nearly 5,000*l.* for the building of this pier?—It was 4,500*l.* Consoles, I believe; but Mr. Green has stated that it realised about 4,000*l.*, and I have no doubt that his figures are correct.

1055. I think I understood you to say that there is no population at Foyens, except the four houses that you mentioned?—That was a figure of speech; there is a village there, but it is a small place; there may be 300 inhabitants.

1056. Is that the terminus of the railway?—Yes.

1057. Is there much traffic on the railway; there cannot be much, I should think?—There is a good deal of passenger traffic in summer, and a certain amount of coals, and so on, that comes in at the port and goes over the railway.

1058. I think I understood you to say that the railway company had not capital enough to develop the pier, or at least you thought probably that they had not?—I do not think that they would be in a position to take it up and develop it.

1059. Would it be to the interest of the railway company to develop it if they had the means?—Yes, I should think so; but I am not skilled in railway management.

1060. I think I also understood you to say that you thought it would cost 5,000*l.* to build accommodation for ocean-going steamers?—Yes; but that is quite a rough estimate, of course.

1061. In the absence of any good local authority, if you were to take the control of the pier as a trustee, would not you incur some personal responsibility by expending such a sum of money as that?—Obviously.

1062. And you would risk that personal responsibility for the sake of developing the pier?—Yes; and developing of my property.

1063. Are you satisfied that the receipts from the pier would pay the expense of the interest on this large expenditure?—I am quite satisfied that they could not do it to begin with, and I think it is very doubtful whether they ever

Mr. Lea—continued.

would; certainly not, I should think, at the rate of harbour dues at present in the schedule of the Bill.

Mr. O'Sullivan.

1064. Do you consider that your interest as a landlord and resident near Foyens is identical with that of the traders and the general public in the district?—I do, practically: if I was in the position of being the harbour authority, it would be my object to develop it, and, as I have already stated, before I got any benefit myself I must benefit the public.

1065. Is there any objection, in your opinion, to the harbour being entrusted to some local body who would be willing to develop it?—None whatever, if such an authority could be found, but I do not see the possibility of finding such an authority.

1066. I thought I heard you say that you did not think such a body could be found, but I wish to ask you what would you think of a body composed of any, the parish priest, for the time being, of Foyens, a representative of the board of guardians of the Rathkeel Union, a representative of the board of guardians of the Newcastle Union, a representative of the shopkeepers of the different small towns within 10 miles, a representative of the Waterford and Limerick Railway Company, and yourself; what would you think of a body composed in that way?—I am afraid that there would be a great number of elements in it.

1067. That is the very thing which we wish to introduce, if possible?—I think it would be rather a divided management, and that most of the persons you name would have no experience whatever, either of the trade internal or external, or of the shipping.

1068. Do you think that these are the different parties who would be interested in that locality?—No doubt they are interested in the locality. Perhaps I ought to say, in further answer to your question, that I do not think that I, myself, could be of any practical use on such a board, and I do not think that I could join it.

1069. The only thing is that you would represent the property, and in order to have all interests represented, I throw that suggestion out; would it be possible that a board could be formed from such a body as I have named, including the boards of guardians, the ratepayers, and the railway company?—I do not think they would see their way to undertake such a large and rather speculative expenditure; I do not see where they could get the money from.

1070. Do you not think that such a body would be better and more representative than any individual?—They would represent more classes, of course; but the question seems to me to be whether they would have the commercial qualities that they would require.

1071. That would be a question afterwards in the selection; with regard to trustees, supposing the harbour were transferred to trustees, or a trustee under the provisions of the Bill, do you think that there would be any possibility of such trustee or trustees making a profit out of the harbour dues?—Under the provisions of the Bill it is quite impossible, because they are bound to

carry

5 May 1885.]

The Right Hon. Lord MONTEAGLE.

[Continued.]

Mr. O'Sullivan—continued.

carry over any excess of receipts over expenditure in the way of reducing the harbour dues; at the same time it is very unlikely that there would be any excess of receipts over expenditure, I should say.

1072. We have no other representative here from either commercial people or shopkeepers in the neighbourhood about Foynes; can you give us any notion of the opinion of local people in that district, as you are the only witness that we have from the district?—I believe that they would like the pier to be under some independent authority who would develop it.

1073. That you believe to be the feeling of the traders round there?—Yes, I think so; I have not had an opportunity of talking with more than one or two of those gentlemen, but there is one man at Foynes who is the only trader there, Mr. Walsh, and I have talked the matter over with him, and from what I have heard I should think that they would not like it to be under the control of the Limerick Harbour Board.

1074. But if it were properly worked and carried out, would it not be to the interests of the traders in Rathkeel, Newcastle, and those towns round there, to get their coals, and one thing and another, to Foynes?—It would be very much to their interest to have their harbour developed, of course.

1075. And do you think that if it were properly worked, the traffic of the harbour would increase very much, that is to say, if it were put in proper order, and properly worked?—I do; I think that the natural advantages of the place for business, its easiness of access from the sea, its immediate communication between the railway and the harbour, and all those natural advantages are so great, that if the place were in proper order, and there were accommodation for the shipping at low water, there would be a great increase of trade.

1076. Could you give the Committee any information as to this; say that a man was getting a cargo of coal from England, Wales, or Scotland, what would be saved by landing it at Foynes in the place of carrying it up to Limerick; could you give us any idea of how much a ton he would save, for instance?—I have not made any calculation by the ton.

1077. Then can you say by the cargo?—To begin with, the dues at Foynes are very much lower; and then, of course, they would avoid the expense of pilotage.

1078. Put the dues out of the question, because the Limerick Harbour Board could reduce the dues if they wished; what would they save in baulage in going up the river to Limerick; what would be the difference, do you think, in a cargo of coals?—It would very much depend upon what vessel the coals were in.

1079. Say a sailing vessel?—There would not be a very great saving on coals; it would be rather a question of freight.

1080. I mean of freight?—It would be rather a question, I mean, of which port the vessels preferred to go to, and whether they thought they had any chance of a return cargo, and so forth; it is rather a complicated question, I think.

1081. We have had evidence that the harbour was very badly in want of dredging, and that it

Mr. O'Sullivan—continued.

required 2,000 l. to put it in repair, as was intended at first?—Mr. Manning's estimate, as I stated just now, was nearer 3,000 l.

1082. Would it not be just that the Board of Works should be compelled to put it in proper order before any local authority should take it over. As the Board of Works have had the control over it, and got dues out of it, do you think that they should be called upon by the Bill to put it in proper order before they handed it over to any other authority?—I should not be in favour of anything in the way of expenditure on dredging, certainly; but if, in order to supply the want that the dredging has not met, it were necessary to expend money, and if the harbour were to be handed over to a local authority, I think it will be a fair matter for consideration, certainly, that the local authority should not take it over from the Government unless the Government spends some money upon it.

1083. Are you of opinion that it is useless to dredge it, that the harbour could work as well without dredging at all?—I think it is throwing money away. I have seen the harbour practically worse within six months of the dredging being carried out, because the dredging was not judiciously conducted, I think, for the general needs of the port. There are generally three berths alongside the pier, and within six or 12 months of the last dredging being carried out, there was only one berth practically available.

1084. And have you any idea what the cost of the T addition to the pier which you suggest would be?—About 5,000 l.

Mr. Cury.

1085. Am I right in thinking that in your opinion there is no local authority in existence at present competent to take this pier over?—Yes; that is my opinion.

1086. And your suspicion is, that if it is handed over to the Limerick Harbour Board, in place of developing Foynes, they might very likely shut it up?—I do not mean to say that they would shut it up.

1087. Practically shut it up?—I think that they could hardly be expected, I think it would not be in human nature that they should go and spend a lot of money at Foynes and push Foynes to the detriment or exclusion of Limerick in any way.

1088. Of course, Limerick being the larger place for the distribution of cargo than Foynes, it is easier to discharge it from Limerick than it would be from Foynes?—I should have thought it would have depended upon what the cargo is. Some things, of course, could be much more easily distributed at Limerick than from Foynes. I should have thought that coal might be more easily distributed from Foynes.

1089. Then there is the railway rate from Foynes to Limerick, or wherever it is distributed?—Yes.

1090. Which, of course, would be an extra cost to the consumer of the coals?—Yes; the reason I mentioned coal was, because coal can be put into trucks at once at Foynes, which cannot be done at Limerick.

1091. Trucks do not go alongside the pier at Limerick, do they?—No; there is no connection
a 2 between

5 May 1885.]

The Right Hon. Lord MONTAGUE.

[Continued.]

Mr. Corry—continued.

Mr. Corry—continued.

between the harbour and the railway at Limerick.

1092. Then there is the cartage between the harbour and the railway station?—Yes; all the coal yards at Limerick are down near the docks. I think very little coal is sent over the railway from Limerick. I fancy the coal that goes inland would come in at other ports, Waterford and Cork.

1093. I understand from you that you are the largest proprietor in that neighbourhood?—I do not know that I am the largest, but I am the most immediately concerned.

1094. And that it would be to your advantage more than other persons to develop the trade at Foynes?—Yes.

1095. And you think that if you had that undertaking in your own hands you could develop it for the benefit of the public, and also for your own benefit, to greater advantage than any other party could?—Yes.

1096. And that if the Bill provided it should be handed over to you, you would undertake to expend a sum of money in developing the harbour which would put it in proper repair?—I do not think there is any complaint of the repairs.

1097. You would be prepared to make it more available for traffic?—Yes, I should be prepared to do that; that is to say, of course, I do not pledge myself to any details in the sum that I have mentioned; it is more estimate.

1098. And you are of opinion that if the plan suggested to you by the engineer were carried out it would altogether obviate the necessity for dredging?—Yes.

1099. Am I right in thinking that some years ago there was a proposal to make Foynes an Atlantic harbour for the dispatch of packets; to make it a station packet, in fact?—The subject has often been suggested. There was a Committee, I think, of the House of Commons; I forget whether it was in the House of Commons or the House of Lords, that sat in the year 1851, to inquire what was the most suitable place for such a harbour if a packet station were to be established on the West Coast of Ireland; and that Committee reported in favour of Foynes, as compared with Galway, on the one side, and with Tarbert, lower down the River Shannon, on the other side.

1100. And had the making of a railway anything to do with that suggestion?—The possibility of connecting that harbour with the railway was taken into consideration; but the railway was not then constructed. I may mention that that Committee reported that at that time it was

estimated that it would cost 13,000*l.* to effect the necessary works at Foynes, 75,000*l.* at Tarbert, and 230,000*l.* at Galway, showing the great natural advantages that exist at Foynes.

1101. I presume Limerick, being so much further up the river, makes the navigation up to Limerick much more dangerous for ships?—Yes, very much more dangerous than it is going to Foynes. Any ship almost that knew the place; in fact, many ships do come in without a pilot, just by the chart, into Foynes; but I do not think that any large vessel could venture to go up to Limerick without a pilot; I do not know whether they would be allowed to do so.

Mr. O'Sullivan.

1102. What is the largest ship that comes up to Foynes at the present time?—We have had men-o-war in the natural harbour; but the largest vessel that can now come in, and the largest that has come in during the last five years, is 400 tons, and has about 16 feet draught of water, that is only at the very highest spring tides, and it has to be pulled in through the reef. At ordinary neap tides the tonnage that can come in there alongside the pier is 80 tons, drawing about 9 feet of water.

Mr. Leo.

1103. Is that because of the mud?—Yes.

Mr. Corry.

1104. In case the pier was extended as you suggested, have you any idea what sized vessel could come alongside then?—I forget the exact details; but I think it was expected to accommodate ships drawing 20 feet of water by that extension at all times of the tide.

1105. You cannot say what the rates on goods and ships are at Limerick, I suppose?—I do not know what the Limerick Harbour dues are.

1106. I may take it from you that, if the harbour was vested in yourself as trustee, it would be to your interest to expend this sum of money upon it, so as to develop it, and in that way you would expect to be repaid for your expenditure?—I do not expect to be repaid for my expenditure out of the harbour, but indirectly by improving the value of my property.

1107. Very often money is expended upon a harbour, not for the purpose of paying, but to improve the property in the neighbourhood?—Yes.

Mr. STEPHEN O'MARA, called in; and Examined.

Mr. Symes.

Mr. Symes—continued.

1108. You are mayor of Limerick, I believe?—Yes.

1109. And you are thoroughly acquainted with the public opinion in Limerick in respect of this question of the Foynes Harbour?—Yes.

1110. What is the universal opinion of the citizens of Limerick, of all classes, with respect to the connection of this harbour with Limerick?—

The universal opinion is that Foynes Harbour should be connected with and managed by the Harbour Commissioners of Limerick.

1111. Are the Harbour Commissioners of Limerick an elective body?—Yes.

1112. How are they elected?—They are elected by four members from the Corporation, four members from the exporters and importers, and

5 May 1885.]

MR. O'MARA.

[Continued.]

Mr. Synge—continued.

Mr. Synge—continued.

and four members from the Chamber of Commerce.

1113. The Chamber of Commerce, I believe, is composed of the wealthiest merchants of Limerick?—Yes.

1114. You have heard the evidence of Lord Montagu, with respect to his apprehensions as to there being a system of rivalry between Foynes and Limerick, in case of its being placed under your control; is there any foundation for that, do you think?—No, I look upon the trade of Foynes as being *nil*.

1115. At present?—At present, and I do not see how the Harbour Board could possibly injure it, and make it worse.

1116. Is it not the interest of the harbour of Limerick, and of the citizens of Limerick, to go out so far as they can for deep water?—Yes.

1117. To improve the trade and river generally?—Yes.

1118. Would not the going out to Foynes at the distance of 20 miles, and the creation of a pier into the deep channel there, bring them to what they want?—Certainly.

1119. And instead of being a system of rivalry, it would be a system of auxiliary help between Foynes and Limerick?—Quite so.

1120. And if the Limerick Harbour Board took this Foynes Harbour up, and expended this money that Lord Montagu referred to, would it not be to the interests of the Harbour Commissioners to develop the rates of the harbour of Foynes to pay that debt?—Yes.

1121. Was it not at one time intended that this harbour of Foynes, when it was originally constructed, should be a transatlantic packet station?—I have heard so.

1122. And recently you know of your own knowledge that it is the wish of the citizens, if it were possible?—Yes, you may put it that way.

1123. Is not that the wish of the citizens of Limerick at this moment?—Yes.

1124. If they got this auxiliary harbour at deep water, as Cork has got Queenstown, would not the establishment of that station be possible for the West of Ireland?—Certainly.

1125. And would not that develop the commerce of Foynes, as well as that of Limerick, at once?—Yes.

1126. Which interest do you think is more consistent with the development of the resources of Foynes, the rivalry between the personal profit of a landlord and the development of a harbour, or the rivalry between the commercial harbour of Limerick, and the development of the harbour; would not the rivalry between the landlord looking after his own interests be greater than the rivalry of the Limerick Harbour Board?—I cannot see any possible reason for a rivalry between the Limerick Harbour Board and the harbour of Foynes.

1127. If the landlord had the harbour in his own hands and applied it to the development and improvement of his own property, might not that prevent the development of the harbour resources?—I can well understand the landlord protecting his own interests in the harbour to the injury of the inhabitants, and to the injury of the harbour itself.

O.S.

1128. And to the injury of the general public?—Yes.

1129. Is the Limerick Harbour Board willing to undertake the responsibility of the debt necessary for the development of Foynes Harbour?—Yes.

1130. Have they an income which would be a sufficient security for that purpose?—Yes.

1131. Have they not at present, by loans from the Government, expended large sums for the improvement of the navigation of the Shannon, not only down to Foynes, but much beyond it?—Yes.

1132. Do they not remove at their own expense all the obstructions to the navigation of the river down to Foynes, and much beyond it?—Yes.

1133. In the way of removing rocks, and in the way of pilotage, and in the way of lights?—Yes.

1134. They do all that work?—Yes.

1135. And would it not help them to do that work more efficiently if they got the auxiliary harbour at Foynes, for the purpose of carrying them into deep water?—Yes.

1136. What is the largest tonnage of ships that come into your docks at present?—1,800 tons.

1137. What would be the largest tonnage that could come up to the jetty at Foynes, in the deep channel; have you estimated that?—No, I have not. I have heard it stated, by good authority, that ships of very much larger tonnage could come to Foynes.

Mr. Corry.

1138. Do you mean register or tonnage?—Register.

Mr. Synge.

1139. That must be, of course, in high tide?—Yes.

1140. At fall tide?—Yes.

1141. Of course, they can float in the docks at any tide?—Yes.

1142. When it was contemplated to make Foynes a packet station for America, surely the channel there out at deep water could float more than 1,000 tons?—Yes.

1143. The largest ship on the ocean could be floated there?—Yes. I have seen some of Her Majesty's Navy floating in Foynes Harbour.

Mr. Lea.

1144. I just want to ask you, how far is it from Dublin to Limerick?—129 miles.

1145. Can you tell me how far it is from Dublin to Cork?—168 miles or 170 miles.

Mr. Kemp.

1146. From Dublin to Foynes is nearly the same distance as from Dublin to Cork, is it not?—From Dublin to Limerick is 129 miles, and from Limerick to Foynes is 23 miles.

Mr. Lea.

1147. What is the chief trade at Limerick?—We have a provision trade, which is very large, in Limerick, and there is a very large tobacco manufactory, and different others.

c 3

1148. Is

5 May 1885.]

Mr. O'MARA.

[Continued.]

Mr. Kenny.

1148. Is the corn trade very large?—Yes, the corn trade is large; the corn importers are the largest in the south of Ireland.

Mr. Lee.

1149. I mean by the trade, chiefly the export and import trade?—So I understand.

1150. Is there much timber trade?—Yes.

1151. I suppose that may be led equally well at Limerick or at Foynes; I mean the timber or grain?—Yes.

1152. Are there many vessels larger than 1,800 tons required for the grain and timber trade?—I understand that if vessels of larger tonnage could come up the merchants would charter them; but there is not sufficient water at Limerick to float larger vessels than 1,800 tons.

1153. Does the tide come up to Limerick?—Yes.

1154. Then I suppose those vessels of 1,800 tons could only come up at high water?—Yes, at high tide.

Mr. O'Sullivan.

1155. I heard you say that the opinion of Limerick was that Foynes Harbour should be controlled by the Limerick Harbour Board?—Yes.

1156. Will you tell the Committee what is the object of that?—The object would be to cultivate the trade of Foynes, and to make Foynes an auxiliary to the trade of Limerick.

1157. Are you satisfied that if the Harbour Board got it they would improve the trade of Foynes far more than it is at present?—That is their object.

1158. Are you aware that the expenses of Foynes Harbour have been far more than the profits up to this time?—I am not aware of my own knowledge, but I have heard so.

1159. Knowing this fact, that the expenses are more than the profits, and that all the money is required to be spent to make a good harbour, are you satisfied that the Limerick Harbour Board would take it and work it properly?—I am quite satisfied that if the Limerick Harbour Board got it they would do everything possible to cultivate the trade of Foynes.

1160. Do you think there is any fear that if they got the full control of it they would leave it idle, and not work it at all?—Not the slightest; it would be against their interest to do so.

1161. It is something like Queenstown, is it not?—Yes, something like it.

Mr. Cerry.

1162. You say that you think that if the Limerick Harbour Board had control of Foynes they would develop the trade there; that it would be to their interest to develop the trade of Foynes?—Yes.

1163. At present, I suppose, the Limerick Harbour Board have no control whatever over Foynes?—Not over Foynes pier and harbour.

1164. Nor the river?—Yes, they exercise pilotage so far as Tarbert, below Foynes.

1165. Do ships going to Foynes pay any dues to the Limerick Harbour Board?—No.

Mr. Cerry—continued.

1166. Neither for pilotage or anything else?—No.

1167. Has there been any difficulty at all found in getting large ships to go up to Limerick?—I do not know myself; I understand that ships of very large tonnage, employed now in the grain trade, could not now go up to Limerick, in consequence of the tide not being sufficiently high to float them.

1168. I have heard that there are great objections to sending large ships to Limerick, of late years, because of some losses that have taken place in the Shannon, is that so?—I have heard of one.

Mr. Kenny.

1169. One vessel was sunk, was it not?—Yes.

Mr. Cerry.

1170. You have no communication from the harbour to the railway station, have you, in Limerick?—No.

1171. Have you any intention of having communication from the harbour to the railway station?—There was such an intention some year or two ago of a communication by tramways, but it fell through from one reason or another. Whether there is a project now I cannot say.

1172. What traffic would you expect now at Foynes?—I imagine that if this pier was extended, as was advocated by the engineer, and that large vessels could float, vessels too large to come to Limerick might be discharged at Foynes, and be distributed by the railway, either into Limerick or in some other part.

1173. The railway coming there alongside the pier?—Yes.

1174. I suppose timber would not be one of the articles that would be likely to be discharged at Foynes?—I do not think so.

1175. It could not be distributed?—The trade is at Limerick.

1176. And there is very little building going on in the neighbourhood of Foynes?—No, I do not think it would be likely.

1177. What depth of water have you in Limerick, do you know?—About 23 or 24 feet.

1178. At high water?—Yes, or perhaps 25 feet, but the engineer is here and will be better able to answer that question.

1179. You do not think that if the Limerick Harbour Board controlled Foynes there would be any danger at all of Boycotting it?—I think it would be directly the interest of the Limerick Harbour Board to develop Foynes for their own sake.

1180. Do you know any instances where Parliament has given authority to a harbour so far up the river as Limerick over one of the entrances of the river?—I do not know any instance; but considering that the Limerick Harbour Board have the lighting and pilotage much further down the river than Foynes, I do not see why they should not have the control of Foynes Harbour.

Chairman.

1181. They have the lighting, have they?—Yes; they have below Foynes; and I do not see any

5 May 1885.]

Mr. O'MARA.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

any reason why they should not get the control of the harbour.

1182. That is under their local Act?—Yes.

Mr. Corry.

1183. You would say then that the Glasgow people should have the control of Greenock Harbour?—I do not know anything about that. If Foynes was Greenock, and Limerick was Glasgow, I would say that Limerick ought not to have the control over Foynes; but Foynes is only a small hamlet, with very little or no trading there; and the harbour is almost closed up by silting mud; and it is really necessary, if you want to keep it open, to put it under the control of some body with funds, and which would be willing to undertake the cost of, and to open it up to the trade of the district.

1184. Do not you think that if an energetic man like yourself had Foynes under your own control you would be more likely to develop it than even the Limerick Harbour Board?—I do not think it would be right to place it under the control of any individual; interests are sometimes not the public interests.

Mr. Kenny.

1185. You think it is a manifest interest to have the control of Foynes?—Yes, I think it is.

1186. And you think that co-operation between Limerick and Foynes would be much more beneficial to both than anything in the shape of competition?—Yes.

1187. In fact, is it your opinion that to speak of competition between Limerick and Foynes is an absurdity?—Yes.

1188. And do you think that Foynes only derives its importance and existence because Limerick is above it?—Yes.

1189. There is a line of railway, is there not, connecting Limerick and Foynes?—Yes.

1190. And the chairman of that railway company is also the chairman of the Limerick Chamber of Commerce and a member of the Limerick Harbour Board?—Yes.

1191. The trade of Limerick is rapidly increasing, is it not?—Yes; the trade of the port of Limerick is increasing rapidly.

1192. What sized vessels can go up to Limerick; of what tonnage?—Close on 2,000 tons; 1,900 tons.

1193. And vessels of about 300 tons can get alongside of Foynes?—Can they.

Mr. O'Sullivan.

1194. Lord Montagu said vessels of about 80 tons?—Yes; that is what I have heard.

(Lord Montagu.) Up to 400 tons in one instance at high water spring tides.

Mr. Kenny.

1195. But even with this new jetty which is proposed to erect jutting into the river, vessels then of 300 tons could, of course, come alongside, according to the evidence of Mr. Green, the assistant engineer of the Board of Works in Ireland?—Yes.

1196. So that really to talk of competition
0.89.

Mr. Kenny—continued.

between Foynes and Limerick, or of the development of Foynes as distinct from Limerick, is a virtual absurdity?—I think it is ridiculous.

Chairman.

1197. As Mayor of Limerick, are you enabled to give an opinion of the satisfactory working of the Limerick Harbour Board?—Yes; I think the Limerick Harbour Board manage the harbour in a most satisfactory manner.

1198. And, I presume, that on these grounds you think that they are quite capable of undertaking the management of another harbour?—Yes; of such another harbour as Foynes, certainly.

1199. Do I rightly understand that the Limerick Harbour Board have pilotage and lighting powers below Foynes?—Yes.

1200. Was that obtained under a local Act?—Yes, I think so.

1201. You have stated that the chairman of the railway company is on the Harbour Board; do you know at all what the opinion of the railway directors is with respect to this pier, whether they desire it to be placed in the hands of the Limerick Harbour Board; or do you know whether they have any opinion at all on the subject?—I have no means of knowing that. I think it would be to the advantage of the railway company to have Foynes Harbour placed under the control of the Limerick Harbour Board.

1202. Presuming this harbour at Foynes was placed under the Limerick Harbour Board, would they be likely to interfere with the trade of the small towns in the immediate neighbourhood of Foynes?—I do not think they would, except to assist the small towns.

1203. They would not be likely, you think, to deprive them of even the small advantages they have at the present time?—Certainly not.

1204. Would they be likely to increase their advantages?—Certainly.

1205. You are aware, probably, that a sum of over 10,000 l. has been spent upon this harbour at Foynes?—Yes.

1206. Of which 6,300 l. and odd was paid out of a grant from the State, and 4,096 l. was paid by Lord Montagu's predecessor?—Yes.

1207. Looking at that large outlay upon the pier by the principal landowner of the district, do you not think that he has some claim for consideration with respect to the future use of the pier?—As I understand the matter he invested, we will say, 6,000 l. in the harbour of Foynes for his own purposes, to enhance the value of his property. That speculation failed. I believe the dues from the harbour never covered the expense of keeping the harbour; but he, all those years, would have reaped a money benefit from it.

1208. Do you not think that he would have some claim to be represented upon whatever authority the harbour is handed over to, in respect of the money which has been spent by his family upon the pier?—I think not. I will go the length of saying that if this Bill gave the control of Foynes Harbour to the Limerick Harbour Board, a representation from the importers of Foynes ought to be on the Limerick Harbour Board.

c 4

1209. You

5 May 1885.]

Mr. O'MARA.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

Mr. Sykes.

1209. You would agree that they should have some representation upon it?—Yes; if there is any doubt about the Limerick Board managing Foynes Harbour advantageously. I would recommend that an elected harbour commission from Foynes should be put on the Board, to look after their interests upon it.

1210. And that representative would be either the landowner, or some other representative, elected by the proper electors?—That representative, I think, should and ought to be elected by the exporters and the importers of Foynes and the vicinity.

1211. Would you not give any representation to the principal landowner of the district?—No, I would not.

1212. You would think it might be advantageous to allow the importers and exporters of Foynes to elect a representative upon the Harbour Board?—Yes.

Mr. Sykes.

1213. One question arises out of the questions which have been asked by the Chairman just now; you heard Lord Montagu state that the only benefit which he would have to his property was the benefit collaterally arising from the development of the harbour?—Yes.

1214. Would he not have that benefit under the Limerick Harbour Board, as well as under any other authority?—Yes.

Mr. Keavy.

1215. And he saved the trouble?—Yes.

The Right Honourable Lord MONTAGU; further Examined.

Mr. Sykes.

1222. Are you aware that the site of Foynes Harbour was changed from its original site to the present site?—I have seen in the reports of the Shannon Commissioners, made previous to the passing of the Act of 1839, a plan showing another site.

1223. Was that before the present harbour was erected?—Yes.

1224. Where was that site?—About 100 or 200 yards to the west of the present harbour.

1225. Would that site have been as much exposed to silting as the present site?—That is an engineering question; I should be rather slow to express an opinion as to that, but I should think not.

1226. Do you think it would be less exposed?—Yes, because the silt would be greater, and the channel is much narrower.

1227. It was nearer the channel, I suppose?—Yes, it would be.

1228. At whose instance was the site changed to its present site?—That I have never been able to learn.

1229. You do not know whether it was your grandfather or the Board of Works that suggested the change?—I am very sure it was not my grandfather; he had no control over the matter at all. Once the Act was passed, all he had to do was to pay down his money.

1216. Do you think, upon consideration, that the Limerick Harbour Board would object to Lord Montagu himself being the representative of that particular harbour?—I, myself, would not advocate it.

1217. But you do not know the opinion of the Limerick Harbour Board?—No; but I know that they are inclined to act generously to Foynes, that they would agree to anything almost that would preserve the rights of Foynes.

Mr. Lea.

1218. I think you said that the railway and harbour at Limerick were not connected; what is the distance between the two?—About a mile or a mile and a half.

Mr. Keavy.

1219. There would be no object served in Limerick, would there, by connecting the railway station and the harbour?—I think not.

Mr. Lea.

1220. Is there much traffic coming into Limerick, and going into the district round; I mean within 50 or 60 miles?—Yes.

1221. Do you think that that traffic could be landed at Foynes and conveyed by railway to those towns, instead of coming into Limerick?—I think some of it might.

Mr. Sykes—continued.

1230. By what authority did you find in the report of the Shannon Commission that the original site was fixed?—The site was selected by the Shannon Commission which was issued for the purpose of reporting on the whole question of the River Shannon; but that Commission was not an executive body; their powers were transferred after the passing of the Act of 1839 to the Board of Works.

1231. But the change was not an improvement in an engineering point of view, in your opinion?—That is rather hard to say. There are disadvantages in the present site, as we all know now; but I think there would have been disadvantages as well as advantages in the original site.

1232. What are the disadvantages beyond silting, in the original site?—I did not say that there would have been any silting in the original site.

1233. Outside the question of silting, what disadvantages were there in the original site?—The channel is very narrow there, and it would be more difficult to take vessels in and to handle the traffic, and to dispose of your traffic.

1234. Is not the channel of the river to the west as broad as the channel of the river to the east?—The channel at the original site is much narrower than the channel where the harbour was constructed. I am not an engineer, but, in my

5 May 1885.]

The Right Hon. Lord MONTEAGLE.

[Continued.]

Mr. SYMONS—continued.

my opinion, the narrowness of the channel would have been seriously felt, it would have diminished the space you have available for dealing with your shipping.

1235. Although the original site was further to the west, you say the channel of the river was narrower?—Yes; I will show you how it is on the chart. The original site was along there, just opposite (describing the scene). The river expands there, and the channel is wider down here than it is below.

1236. It gets narrower at the neck?—Yes, that is it.

1237. You stated to the Committee that, beyond developing the trade of Foynes, you have no personal interest in the matter?—Certainly.

1238. And if the development of the trade did not immediately benefit your property, it would be of no use whatever to you to place the harbour in your hands?—I do not quite understand your question.

1239. If the development of the general trade by water and by rail did not immediately serve your property, you would have no interest in Foynes Harbour?—My interest in the harbour is as a landowner.

1240. That is the question I asked you; if the development by water and by rail did not immediately benefit your property, you would have no personal interest in the matter, you would gain nothing by it; is not that the logical conclusion?—I do not quite understand what you mean by the word "immediately;" I should only gain by enhancing the value of the adjoining lands.

1241. Would it enhance it immediately?—No.

1242. Within what time would it enhance it?—That is a matter of speculation.

1243. It may never enhance it?—I think there can be no doubt whatever that if the harbour is extended the value of the adjoining property will be enhanced. It is quite impossible for any individual to say to what extent or at what period it would be enhanced.

1244. No doubt it may be enhanced under certain circumstances, but if goods traffic comes by water to the terminus of the railway, and goes immediately away from the harbour by the railway, it can be no benefit to you as a proprietor; is not that so?—If every ounce of goods landed there were put straight into a truck and sent away, it is conceivable that it might diminish, to some extent, the value of the harbour to the landowner.

1245. It may diminish it; that is the answer I expected; I do not know whether you agree with me, but it is not the case that the only event in which it could be of permanent use to the proprietor, is the event of Foynes becoming a town?—I think the way in which the increased value would arise to the landowner, would be, of course, by some increase in the business or in the population of the place. I never heard of a harbour which did not lead to some increase in business and population, and I have not contemplated such a possibility.

1246. At present Foynes only consists, I believe, of one man in business and a number of small labourers' houses connected with the railway; 0.88.

Mr. SYMONS—continued.

is not that a general idea of it?—I do not know; I suppose by a man in business, you allude to Mr. Walsh.

1247. I do?—I do not know what the definition of a man in business is; there are a great many more people in business there, but Mr. Walsh is the largest.

1248. How many business people, large or small, are there in Foynes, independent of the railway labourers, and independent of the sailors in the ships that sometimes come to the Shannon?—I say that there is no large business man there except Mr. Walsh. I stated in my evidence in chief, that the place was completely in embryo.

1249. I am talking of a business less than that of Mr. Walsh?—There are other people in business there, of course.

1250. Small business?—Yes.

1251. You stated to the Committee that you did not think the Board of Guardians, that is to say the sanitary authority contemplated by this Bill, was a fit authority to whom to entrust this harbour?—I think I said that I should not think they would be either willing or able to undertake the large expenditure that would be necessary.

1252. Do you think that the sanitary authority would raise 5,000 l. upon the rates, if they got the charge of Foynes Harbour?—No, I do not think they would.

1253. Are you aware that the grand jury passed two resolutions in the county of Limerick?—I am.

1254. You have had the kindness to hand me those resolutions. The first of them is, that they were of opinion that the Board of Works should put this harbour in proper condition by repaving it before it was handed over to any authority?—I do not remember the exact terms of the resolution.

1255. Here it is, "The Commissioners of Public Works, who have heretofore received the tolls, and who are responsible for the maintenance of the pier and harbour, shall first place said pier and harbour in a proper state of repair." Do you agree with that resolution?—I have stated my opinion already to be, that if it were to be handed over by the Board of Works to any local authority, such as is mentioned in the Bill, that is to say, to anybody that had power to raise rates for the purpose of affording collateral security for the expenditure there, in that case I think it would be only fair that the local authorities should be able to ask the Board of Works and the Government to do something to put the harbour into a state of repair, before they took over such a serious responsibility.

1256. Now, the second resolution is this, "That the Board of Works shall not be at liberty to transfer as aforesaid, unless such county trustee or authority shall first consent to undertake the maintenance of such pier and harbour under the provisions of the Bill." Do you agree in that resolution?—I do.

1257. I suppose I am right in assuming that the county of Limerick have refused through their grand jury to accept this harbour with its responsibilities; is not that your opinion?—I do not know that that precise question was before them.

1258. But

5 May 1885.]

The Right Hon. Lord MONTEAGLE.

[Continued.]

Mr. Sykes—continued.

1238. But they have not made any offer to accept it?—I am not aware that they have.

1239. Now, whatever authority accepted, it should be willing to raise upon the rates a sum of 5,000 £. to put this harbour in proper condition; is not that so according to your evidence?—If it were to be handed over to the local authority, I do not think they could put it into a state to accommodate the traffic without very considerable expenditure, something like that amount.

1240. Is there any local authority that you could name in Foynes, who would be sufficient to do that independently of yourself?—I think not.

1241. You yourself not having rates, but having land, and being in the position, and in some persons' opinion a very unfortunate position, at the present time, of being an Irish landowner, your only security to offer would be the rent; is not that so, of your own land, to the Government for the loan of 5,000 £. on collateral security?—In my evidence before the Committee I did not make an *exposé* of all my property to them; I did not say that I had none but in hand, I was stating in answer to a general question put to me by the Chairman that I thought that where trustees were contemplated some power should be given to lend money to them on some collateral security, such as land or otherwise, to be approved by the Treasury.

1242. If the Limerick Harbour Board has an income equal to yours, could not they offer a collateral security as sufficiently and efficiently as you could to the Treasury?—Yes.

1243. You have heard the evidence of the Mayor of Limerick, have you not, upon this subject, which you stated, as to there being a rivalry growing up between Limerick and Foynes, and Limerick sacrificing Foynes?—I only heard the evidence of the Mayor very partially; I came in just before the conclusion of it, and I did not hear the greater portion of it, I think.

1244. Are you still of opinion, that the Limerick Harbour would be a rival of the Foynes Harbour, and that the Limerick Harbour Board would not develop the resources of the Foynes Harbour?—I do not think it would ever be the interest of Limerick, as a whole, that Foynes should be developed in such a way as to accommodate traffic at Foynes that is now going to Limerick.

1245. Would Limerick gain by going into deeper water, and floating ships of 4,000 tons 25 miles down the river?—Some people might gain.

1246. Would not the cargoes of this deep heavy tonnage necessarily be landed at Foynes?—In preference to Limerick you mean, I suppose.

1247. They could not come to Limerick, as the Mayor has told us?—I did not hear that.

1248. The Mayor has told us that the heaviest vessel coming into Limerick was 1,800 tons; I believe that your grandfather contemplated making Foynes an American packet station, did he not?—I have no doubt that the idea often suggested itself to his mind.

1249. And is not the idea, at this moment in the minds of some people in Limerick, and in Foynes?—I have heard so.

Mr. Sykes—continued.

1250. Supposing that an American packet ship would find sufficient water at Foynes, and would not be able to come up to Limerick, would not Limerick gain by that, and would not Foynes gain by that?—If an American packet could be induced to come to the Shannon, of course it would be an advantage to Limerick, and to Foynes as well, if it landed at Foynes; but I must go on to express my opinion that I should not be very sanguine of American packets being induced to come up the Shannon.

1251. No, I do not think you are at all sanguine, nor indeed do I think any of us are sanguine as to the future, seeing what has happened to Foynes in the past?—I am sanguine as to certain branches of business coming there if proper accommodation is provided; but I should not be very sanguine of large American liners carrying mails, and so forth, coming there.

1252. Neither am I very sanguine about that; but at all events the only way of doing it would be by having deep water enough for the ships, would it not?—Undoubtedly.

1253. And safe anchorage?—Undoubtedly.

1254. And would not the proper authority that is now over the navigation of the Shannon, be the proper authority for that purpose?—If you mean that the Limerick Harbour Board would be the proper authority, that body is not responsible for the navigation of the Shannon.

1255. Does it not look after it now?—Limerick is not responsible for the navigation of the Shannon, or for the maintenance of the Channel within 10 miles of Foynes, I believe.

1256. Does not Limerick exercise rights of pilotage at this moment to the mouth of the Shannon?—Yes, of pilotage right down to the mouth.

1257. Does it not exercise the lighting of the river beyond Turbert?—No; they may put lights for their own convenience, but they are not responsible for maintaining lights in the river for the use of the public generally.

1258. Is it not their interest to do so?—It may be their interest to put a light or beacon somewhere, but they are not the authority charged by Parliament with that duty.

1259. Would it not be their interest to do so, if they wanted to increase the traffic on the river?—It may be so; I did not say that it was not their interest to do so; it is only in reply to your question as to the navigation authority, that I state that I do not think they are the authority for the navigation of the river generally.

1260. I do not want to say that under an Act of Parliament they have the exclusive right, but do they exercise the right and watch the navigation of the river, through their engineer, at this moment?—I dare say they do.

1261. Did you hear that part of the evidence of the Mayor with respect to there being no rivalry between the local towns and the Harbour Board of Limerick?—Yes; I heard the Mayor asked the question, and I heard his answer.

1262. And he said, that on the contrary their interests would be the other way?—I am afraid I did not very clearly hear the Mayor's answer, and I could not express an opinion upon it without hearing what he did say; but if you wish to ask me any question upon the subject, I shall be quite willing to answer it to the best of my ability.

1263. Do

5 May 1884.]

The Right Hon. Lord MONTAGUE.

[Continued.]

Mr. Spence—continued.

1283. Do you think that the Limerick Harbour Board would interfere with the trade of the local towns?—I think that it would be for the interest of the trades in the local towns, that Foynes Harbour should be developed, and I suppose that they would be the best judges of whether they thought the Limerick Harbour Board would discharge that function to their satisfaction. I have expressed my opinion before, that I do not think it would be for the interest of Limerick to develop Foynes; and if they did not so develop it, it would so far be a disadvantage to the local traders.

1284. Would it not be the interest of the Limerick Harbour Board, if they raised this money and subjected themselves to the present debt on the harbour, to increase the income and raise the dues of the harbour as much as possible; would it not be manifestly their pecuniary interest?—Possibly some people might think so.

1285. As an honest commercial body, I mean?—It is very difficult to say what individual people will think is their interest.

1286. But it is not individual people; it is a board subject to public opinion?—Subject to the public opinion of Limerick.

1287. Of the whole county of Limerick?—I do not think the harbour board of Limerick is much affected by the public opinion of the county.

1288. Do you mean to tell me that the Limerick Harbour Board, in possession of Foynes, should not consult the public opinion of that part of the county as well as of the city?—I think that, the city being nearer to them, and all their relations and interests being there, they would be more affected by the public opinion of the city than by that of the county.

1289. Would it not be their interest to look after the public opinion of the district as well as that of the city of Limerick?—Comparatively speaking, it would not, I think.

1290. Not so much, you mean?—Exactly.

1291. But would it not be their interest, to a certain extent?—If there was no interest in any other direction.

1292. If there was no interest in any other direction?—Yes.

1293. If vessels of 4,000 tons can come into Foynes and cannot come to Limerick, there is no interest in the other direction, is there?—There might be the interest of a great many parties in Limerick who might like to keep the trade there.

1294. And to exclude any other trade?—Yes.

1294.* If the trade of Foynes does not interfere with the trade of Limerick in the way of those large ships, how can they possibly have an interest in injuring the trade of the district?—I do not quite understand your question.

1295. I will put it in the concrete fashion. If there is not a rivalry between Limerick, which is able to carry 1,900 tons up to its docks, and Foynes which is able to bring 4,000 tons into Foynes channel, what possible interest can the Limerick Harbour Board have in excluding the 4,000 tons?—I really do not know whether 4,000 tons was ever brought in one ship. One honourable member of the Committee seems to think that

0.89.

Mr. Spence—continued.

the 1,900 tons that now goes up to Limerick is a very large quantity.

1296. Will 3,000 tons come into Foynes; I am not talking of the harbour, but of the natural basin?—I really cannot say.

1297. At all events, you give up the sanitary authority as the local authority?—I do not think that the sanitary authority would be a suitable body to undertake such responsibility.

1298. And the only question therefore is this, I ask you with respect to the expenditure of your grandfather; that expenditure may be of use, or it may not; would you object to the offer of the Limerick Harbour Board to accept the representation in the Limerick Harbour Board to look after the interests of the locality?—No such offer has ever been made, so far as I am aware.

1299. Supposing it were made?—What is the offer?

1300. To have Foynes represented in the Limerick Harbour Board to look after the interests of Foynes?—One of your first questions was, whether there was anything beyond Mr. Walsh and myself at Foynes, and I answered, that there was not.

1301. Cannot you answer the question, forgetting that?—There is nothing at Foynes to be represented in the way of right.

1302. Have you not to be represented?—One of the answers of the Mayor, which I did hear, was, that they would not wish to have me represented.

1303. But he did not give the opinion of the Limerick Harbour Board; it was his own personal opinion?—You ask me whether, if the harbour board offered that Foynes should be represented, I should be satisfied.

1304. The offer of the Mayor, as I understand it, is this, to have the exporters and importers at Foynes, which you look upon as such an extensive district, represented on the Limerick Harbour Board?—I never said that there was an extensive district; all the evidence which I have given is the same as the other evidence, that there are none.

1305. Then there are no exporters or importers in Foynes?—Practically, there are no importers or exporters there, except Mr. Walsh and myself.

1306. Is Mr. Walsh an importer?—Yes; he brings cargoes of coals there.

Mr. Kenny.

1307. Are you aware that under the management of the Shannon Trust the expenditure on Foynes Harbour has been double the receipts?—I do not know the exact proportions; but there has been a large excess, in consequence of the expenditure on dredging, over the receipts.

1308. Will you tell me on what grounds you think that you can manage Foynes Harbour to so much greater advantage, that you can make it a paying concern?—To so much greater advantage than Limerick, do you mean?

1309. No; but upon what grounds do you imagine that you can manage it to greater advantage; that is to say, if you got complete control of Foynes Harbour, that you will change it

H 2

from

5 May 1885.]

The Right Hon. Lord MONTEAGLE.

[Continued.]

Mr. Kenny—continued.

from being a losing concern to being a paying concern?—In the first place, I have explained in my evidence previously that the dredging to which this deficiency is due has been, in my opinion, so much money thrown away. There has been a large expenditure without any corresponding advantage; so that I think that merely by stopping the dredging you would diminish the expenditure very largely, and would not suffer any loss.

1310. I thought I understood you to say that, in consequence of the want of dredging, the accumulation of silt was so great in the harbour that where there was at one time quaysage for four vessels, within six months the amount of quaysage had diminished so much as to offer accommodation to only one vessel?—My answer was to a question, I think put by the Chairman, as to the effect of the dredging that was carried out. I said that I thought that the dredging was so far from being any use, that in one case that had come under my knowledge, on the last occasion when it was dredged it had absolutely done damage, because the inequalities of the mud bank left inside the harbour left practically only one berth instead of three.

1311. Do you agree with the engineer of the Board of Works when he said, as I understood him, that in consequence of the peculiar manner in which Foynes Harbour had been constructed it offered peculiar facilities for the silting up of mud within the harbour?—Undoubtedly.

1312. So you think that the construction of the proposed jetty, that is the T shaped jetty outside the harbour, would have the effect of minimising the tendency of accumulation of mud, the tendency to silt up?—I do not think that it would affect the accumulation of mud within the harbour one way or the other.

1313. But, in any case, the construction of the proposed T jetty would mean a considerable additional expenditure?—Yes.

1314. So that, notwithstanding any saving you might make by discontinuing dredging, there would be considerable expenditure incurred in the construction of the new pier?—Yes.

1315. And that would, after all, only accommodate vessels, according to the evidence of the Engineer of the Board of Works, 300 tons burden or so?—I do not know exactly what length of extension the engineer, Mr. Green, contemplated; but I did not understand him to say that 300 tons would be the maximum that would be accommodated by the jetty he mentioned; I do not think that was the maximum.

1316. I understood him to give that as the maximum?—I think the extension, which Mr. Green suggested, was 80 feet; I am not quite certain, but the extension I was referring to was, I think, about 100 feet; I was looking at the chart to see if I could help you, but there is no scale of feet upon it.

Mr. Kenny—continued.

1317. One hundred or 200 feet, or something of that kind, I think?—Mr. Green suggested 80 feet out into the channel, and then a T head of 300 feet.

1318. As trustee of the Harbour Board you would have a right to acquire lands, and to borrow money and to strike a rate under the provisions of the Bill?—I do not think there are any powers of acquiring land, as far as I remember.

1319. There is a power of acquiring land under the Bill?—I have not a copy here.

1320. That is contained in the Bill, as at present draughted?—That is only for the purposes of extending the harbour; only what may be necessary for carrying out the works.

1321. Do you think that a power of that kind should be entrusted to an individual?—It depends upon the particular circumstances I should say.

1322. I confine myself to this particular instance. Do you think that in this case it would be desirable?—There would be no land required to be acquired for the extension that is contemplated in the case of Foynes.

1323. But it may be found desirable in the future to make Foynes Harbour a very large place; a very capacious harbour to accommodate ocean going steamers?—Then in that event I am already in possession of the land, and I apprehend that no difficulty would arise.

1324. I suppose you are aware that the Chairman of the Limerick and Foynes Railway Company is a member of the Harbour Board in Limerick?—The Limerick and Foynes Railway has ceased to exist, because it is amalgamated in the Waterford and Limerick. Mr. Speight is the Chairman of the latter.

1325. And he is a member of the Harbour Board, and Chairman of the Chamber of Commerce?—Yes.

1326. You spoke of transferring the control of these different works, from the Board of Works Ireland, to the Board of Trade in London?—Yes.

1327. Are you in favour of transferring the control of purely Irish matters to boards in London?—That depends upon the particular circumstances. I do not think that the Board of Works has proved a very satisfactory body for harbour works in Ireland.

1328. In the event of the reconstruction of the Board of Works, so as to make it a better body, do you not think that it would be better to have the control of Irish affairs vested in an Irish body, with the seat of government in Dublin?—That is rather a large question of policy. The opinion which I ventured to express was only with respect to the existing state of affairs.

5 May 1885.

Mr. ROBERT MACDONNELL, called in; and Examined.

Mr. SYMON.

1329. You are a member of the Limerick Harbour Board?—Yes.

1330. How long have you been a member of that board?—Since the board was formed under the present Act in 1858.

1331. That is an elective board, as the mayor told us?—Yes.

1332. You are also a magistrate of the City of Limerick?—Yes.

1333. And you are thoroughly conversant, I presume, with the increase of the trade of Limerick, and the improvement of the navigation of the river?—I am.

1334. Can you give the Committee an idea in general terms of the increase in trade since you became a member of the Harbour Board, and of the improvements in the river?—Before we got control of the harbour, it was previously managed by the Board of Works. There was a board in existence called the Bridge Commissioners, but practically the board was under the control of the Board of Works in Dublin, and of course it was almost impossible to carry out any improvements in the navigation of the river. At that time our tonnage was about between 80,000 and 90,000 tons, and the receipts from the harbour dues, tonnage dues, and all other sources, was somewhere between 5,000 £ and 7,000 £. I could give you the exact figures if necessary.

1335. What is the tonnage now, and what is the increase of the dues?—The tonnage now in the last three years averages close on 170,000 tons, or very nearly double the amount it was before the present Harbour Commissioners got the control of the harbour of Limerick in 1858.

1336. And what is the value now of the dues?—The dues now from all sources last year were about 12,000 £; it is right to say that the harbour board reduced the dues; they made a considerable reduction in the dues, taking off a sum of 3,000 £ or 4,000 £. If that sum had remained, if the dues had remained at the old rate, the total income of the harbour last year would have been something like 15,000 £ as against 8,000 £ or 7,000 £ in 1855 and 1857, before we got the control and management of the harbour.

1337. Then with the reduction, the dues have doubled, and if the dues were left as they were, they would have trebled?—They would have considerably more than doubled; nearly trebled perhaps.

1338. What is the largest tonnage which is at present able to float on a high tide up to Limerick beyond Foynes?—We have had vessels of about 2,000 tons register.

1339. That is the largest?—That is the largest, and that is a very large size.

1340. What is the largest that could float in the channel at Foynes?—I suppose almost the largest vessel in the Navy could come up there.

1341. At the end of the pier that is proposed to be erected, that is to say, this jetty that Lord Montagu says is necessary at a cost of 5,000 £, the largest vessel in the Navy could come up there?—I cannot say that.

G. 59.

Mr. SYMON—continued.

1342. Going out to the channel of the river?—At the entrance of the natural harbour of Foynes the largest also merchant vessel or even men-of-war could come in. One of the largest men-of-war, the "Valiant," has been anchored off there; but with the projected pier that Lord Montagu speaks of, I could not say what draught of water would be there at the lowest tides; but I believe that there is a more suitable place than Lord Montagu has referred to for a pier that could be made perhaps quite as inexpensively as the addition he speaks of.

1343. Where is that?—Further down to the westward.

1344. About the original site of Foynes Harbour?—Yes, the original site that was named at the time of the Commission in 1851.

1345. It would be an advantage to the City of Limerick that large vessels beyond 1,900 tons should come up to Foynes, would it not?—Certainly.

1346. And would it be an advantage also to Foynes?—Of course it would be an advantage, at least, I presume so, to Foynes.

1347. Can you tell us if there is any possibility, or any foundation, for the idea which we have heard expressed of a rivalry between Limerick and Foynes, if Foynes becomes an auxiliary of Limerick?—I do not think it; I know of no reason why there should be any rivalry.

1348. If the large vessels will serve both Limerick and Foynes, I mean?—Yes.

1349. Your board is willing to undertake an additional expense after the harbour is put into fair repair for developing the resources of Foynes; is that so?—Certainly; we are quite prepared to do that.

1350. And your income is quite sufficient to do that?—Not only that; but if the sum was only 5,000 £ we would not require to ask a loan, or anything else; we could do it at once; we have sufficient funds in hand for what we consider a small outlay of that sort.

1351. Without any difficulty whatever?—Yes.

1352. Do you think it possible that there could be any injury or rivalry between the trade of the agricultural towns near Foynes and Limerick, provided the Limerick Harbour Board got it, and were bound to make this expenditure, and to maintain the harbour?—Certainly not; I do not think there is any reason why there should be, Limerick merchants could send cargoes into Foynes, and sell them in those towns as the others do now.

1353. And would it not be a greater facility to the Limerick merchants to land cargoes of large vessels, and send them on by railway into those towns than to bring them into Limerick?—In case the vessel could not get to Limerick, you mean.

1354. It would be a greater facility to send cargoes by main express to those local towns than to bring the vessel to Limerick, and transport them back?—It depends, of course, upon the question of railway distance.

1355. But there is a railway from Foynes
H 3 Harbour

6 May 1865.]

Mr. MACDONNELL.

[Continued.]

Mr. Synge—continued.

Harbour to those towns, Rathkell, Newcastle, and Eskaton; is there not a railway direct from Foynes to those towns?—Eskaton is a little harbour of itself.

Mr. O'Sullivan.

1356. Do you think carriers would come there?—That is a question of railway rates.

Mr. Synge.

1357. But whether by carriers on the road or by carriers on the rail, and no body of men in their senses could think of bringing it into Limerick, and sending it back to those towns; is not that so?—Yes; perhaps I ought to mention to the Committee that the total money borrowed from the Government by the Limerick Harbour Board since 1868 was about 76,779 £, of which they have actually repaid up to the present time 48,925 £, leaving at the present time due to the Government only 27,854 £; and the Committee will be aware that a large sum of interest has also been paid during that period.

1358. Within what time?—Since 1868, since we got control of the harbour.

Mr. Lea.

1359. Can you tell me the difference in the charges between the harbour dues of Limerick and those proposed to be authorised by the Bill?—The harbour dues in Limerick are something higher.

1360. Do you know how much higher?—If I had the schedule before me I could tell you at once.

1361. Here is the schedule if you will look at it (handing the schedule to the witness)?—(After referring to the schedule). The difference I see on goods is this, Limerick is almost a free port; there are only two or three classes of goods that pay any harbour dues, that is coals, timber and grain; every other class of goods in Limerick is exempt; I see in this list here, that a great number of articles are charged in Foynes at the rate of 1½ d., and the charge in Limerick is an average charge of somewhere about 3 d.; yet everything appears to be charged under the schedule at Foynes.

1362. If Foynes Pier were handed over to the Limerick Harbour Board, should you raise the rates at Foynes to the same amount as the rates at Limerick?—No, we have no such intention; I presume that under the Bill we have no power to do so.

Mr. Synge.

1363. You may reduce them, but you cannot raise them?—No, we cannot raise them. According to the schedule the difference in shipping is not very considerable either, I see; it is 5 d. in Foynes and 8 d. in Limerick; but vessels in Foynes are only allowed to lie a certain number of days; they are allowed 14 days in Foynes, and they are allowed a month in Limerick; and, of course, a shipowner knows that that makes a considerable difference.

Chairman.

1364. Do your rates that you have named to us include dock dues, or are they in addition?—

Chairman—continued.

The dues that I have mentioned are all the dues we have, that is to say on goods; but we have a separate charge on shipping, a dock charge. A great many vessels do not use the dock at Limerick, that is, small vessels.

Mr. O'Shea.

1365. What is the dock charge?—Sevenpence per ton on foreign vessels, and only 5d. on coasters.

Chairman.

1366. Of course there is no dock charge in this schedule?—No; there is, of course, no dock at Foynes.

Mr. O'Sullivan.

1367. Knowing the large capital that is required to put Foynes in proper working order, are you able to state, on behalf of the Limerick Harbour Board, that you would undertake all that expenditure in order to put it in that state of order?—I understood that the opinion seemed to be that the Board of Works would do it. A great deal would depend upon what is decided to be done with the little harbour. If that was retained as it is at present there would have to be a considerable outlay upon it.

1368. In any case, I suppose we cannot make the Board of Works extend the pier; but with regard to that you see a pier is required to work it, and do you think that your board would be willing to extend the pier if they were given it in working order?—I think they would; the probability is (subject to the consideration of the engineering questions), that as at present advised our board would, as I have already stated, be inclined to have a new pier. Of course I speak under correction of the engineers; but I think the idea of Lord Montagu, of putting an addition to the present one, might be injurious to the navigation of the channel and the harbour, which is not very wide there.

1369. But you are quite satisfied that your board would do all they possibly could to work the harbour fairly, and not curtail it in any way?—Certainly; it would be their interest to do so.

1370. But are you quite satisfied that they would?—Yes, it is the unanimous wish of the board.

1371. Would your board have any objection to allow a representative of the traders and ratepayers of the Foynes district to be on the board?—No, I think not; in fact I know they would not.

1372. Would they admit two representatives, one representing trade, and another representing property?—Yes. These are days when representation is supposed to go with taxation, and I do not see why the parties who pay the rates and dues at Foynes would not be entitled to representation.

1373. Do you expect that the traffic of Foynes Harbour would considerably increase if you were to put it in proper repair?—I think it would certainly.

1374. Are you quite certain that your board would develop it as much as they could?—I am quite satisfied that they would.

1375. You

5 May 1885.]

Mr. MACDONNELL.

[Continued.]

Mr. Corry.

1375. You have told us that the trade tonnage and dues arising from the Port of Limerick have been increased considerably since the present Limerick Harbour Board got the working of it?—Yes.

1376. Has not that been the case with all the neighbouring harbours?—I think not. I do not think that any of them have increased as fast as Limerick.

1377. Trade, for instance?—I do not think that any Irish harbour has increased as fast as Limerick has increased since 1838.

1378. What is the average tonnage of ships coming to Limerick; we have heard of one of 1,400 tons, but I expect there would be very few birds of that class?—Perhaps not quite so large, but there are very large vessels coming from San Francisco; the great development of the San Francisco wheat trade has brought very large tonnage into the channel.

1379. Are you aware that the traders of Limerick have found any difficulty in getting ships of large tonnage to go to Limerick, or not?—I think not. Occasionally there may be some few vessels that might have an objection to coming there; but, as a rule, I do not think they have any great difficulty.

1380. Can they come up at all states of the tide, I mean at high-water, to discharge their cargoes in the docks?—At spring tides.

1381. Only at spring tides?—Yes; for those very large vessels.

1382. If they arrive at other states of the tide are they obliged to lighter?—Yes; that is the case at almost every port in the kingdom.

1383. Supposing that Foynes were made available, would they be able to discharge at Foynes?—Yes; it would be the idea, no doubt, to unload a portion of the cargo there, and bring the vessel on to Limerick.

1384. What trade do you expect you would develop if the Harbour Commissioners of Limerick had the control of Foynes?—First of all it would be very useful for the purpose that I have named, that you could discharge very large vessels there, whether they arrived at neap or low tides, it would enable them to come to Limerick; and then again the coal trade has been increasing very much lately, and I have no doubt that if there were facilities at Foynes it would be developed very largely. Occasionally, no doubt, some of the country millers would get cargoes landed at Foynes if they have proper accommodation.

1385. I think the Mayor was asked whether it was not manifestly the interest of Limerick to have the control of Foynes; I would ask you whether it is manifestly the interest of Foynes that Limerick should have the control?—I think it is; I do not see any local body that could develop the port; it would be no injury to Limerick, and it would be an advantage to Foynes manifestly; and with much respect to Lord Montagu, I do not think that these are days when any man would like a private individual to have control of the harbour; he may be very good in himself, but we cannot tell what those succeeding him might do; they might sell it to the railway company.

1386. And that is a very good thing too, some-
0.89.

Mr. Corry—continued

times?—Sometimes it is, and sometimes it would be very injurious, as you know, to the locality.

1387. You have no direct railway communication, as I understand, from the harbour at Limerick?—We wanted direct communication years ago; but it is just as I say about the railway company sometimes not serving the locality; the railway company prevented us when we tried to make it some few years ago, and then they prevented their rivals, the Great Southern and Western from making it; and between them the result has been that the harbour has been left in an unfortunate state, without communication; but we, the Limerick Harbour Commissioners, are determined to either make it ourselves or to force either of those companies to do it.

1388. For the development of the harbour, are you quite satisfied that it is the interest of the Harbour Commissioners to make a railway along the quays?—We would do it at once, but the Committee are aware that railway companies have often the power of blocking useful works of that sort, if they do not think it for their narrow-minded self-interest.

1389. You have stated that the Harbour Commissioners have paid off a large sum of money that they had borrowed from the Board of Works; I suppose you are paying interest to the Treasury here, or to the Board of Works?—The money was practically borrowed from the Treasury.

1390. You are paying principal and interest?—Yes, we pay both.

1391. Is there any other debt besides that?—No; that is the entire debt of the harbour, 30,000*l.* I believe it is one of the few harbours that can say that it has a very small debt upon it, taking its resources and its income into consideration.

Mr. Kenny.

1392. Do you think it possible, under any circumstances, that a conflict of interest could occur between Limerick and Foynes Harbour?—Under the present circumstances I do not think it could; it is impossible to say what might arise in the distant future.

1393. In the event of its being necessary to develop Foynes to any great extent, do you not think that it would be more the interest of Limerick to develop Foynes than any other place?—Certainly.

Chairman.

1394. If this harbour were transferred to the Limerick Harbour Board, I suppose you would have no objection to there being some controlling power to take care that in the future they carried out the object of the transfer, and that it was not allowed to go into a state of disrepair?—I suppose that would be provided for in the Bill.

1395. You would have no objection to such a power being placed in the Bill?—No, not in the Bill; but we would not like to put ourselves under the control of the Board of Works.

1396. I did not say that; but if this pier were transferred to you, do you think you would really go into the matter with the intention of using it for the general advantage of the district, and also for the advantage of your own place,
n 4 that

5 May 1885.]

Mr. MACDONNELL.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

that is to say, Limerick itself?—Certainly; that is our intention; we would proceed at once to take steps to improve it.

1397. I am glad to be able to congratulate you on the way in which you have paid off your debt,

Mr. JEROME COUNIHAN, called in; and Examined.

Mr. Synan.

1398. You are a member of the Limerick Harbour Board?—I am.

1399. How long have you been a member of that Board?—I have been a member of it for several years; I am elected from the Corporation. I was twice elected on the Limerick Harbour Board.

1400. And you are a member of it at present?—Yes.

1401. I presume I need not ask you any question as to the increase of profits in the Harbour of Limerick. Do you agree with Mr. MacDonnell's evidence?—I do.

1402. You are personally and thoroughly acquainted with the Harbour of Foynes, are you not?—Yes, I know it intimately.

1403. You know its present discreditable condition?—Yes, I do.

1404. You know its history?—Yes, I have been acquainted with it for some years.

1405. From the time it was proposed to make it a packet station, down to the present time, I suppose?—Hardly so long as that, but I have been intimate with its history for a long time.

1406. Do you agree with Lord Montagu, or with Mr. MacDonnell, as to the place where the pier should be extended at Foynes?—The pier is in the wrong place, in my opinion.

1407. You agree with Mr. MacDonnell that it ought to be farther west?—Yes, I agree with Mr. MacDonnell. I may say that our interest has gone so far in Foynes, and its improvement, that some time ago our harbour engineer made a plan for what we proposed as a new pier there, westward of course of the present pier.

1408. Taking any engineering opinion as to the cost of that pier to the westward, would it be less or more than the cost of the extension of the present pier?—It would be more.

Mr. CURRY.

—It would be connected with the railway?

Mr. Synan.

1410. It would come into the railway, would it not?—Yes, it would.

1411. Is there a private rail from the station at present, down to Foynes Harbour?—The railway runs to the head of the pier.

1412. And the pier that you propose to build would come into the same point, would it not?—The pier that we propose should be built would run along in that way in connection with the present one, rather closer to the old harbour than you have heard so much about, as sitting up as fast

Chairman—continued.

and I hope that if you undertake this work, you may be able to undertake it in the same satisfactory way in which you have undertaken your own affairs?—Thank you.

Mr. Synan—continued.

as it is dredged; it would extend on to deep water, parallel with the coast there; in fact, to where there is such a depth of water at present that the small steamers, river steamers and large craft, can run very close in.

1413. Is there sufficient depth of water at the end of the pier that is proposed to be built to float any vessel in the channel?—There would be sufficient depth of water to float very much larger vessels than can come up to Limerick now.

1414. I suppose double the tonnage could be accommodated there?—I would not say double.

1415. Now you have heard the evidence as to local bodies being given the care and maintenance of this pier: do you not think it would require a strong and wealthy local body to take the custody of this pier and to go to this expense?—I think it would be a great mistake, both for Foynes, and for the whole of the district, to hand the custody of the pier over to any body, except one with all the appliances in the shape of staff and machinery, such as the Limerick Harbour Board has, and with the strong back of its income, and the funds it could command otherwise for such a purpose, and besides any work that they did for its improvement would not tax the local residents in any possible way, it would not be a tax on any body except the harbour board.

1416. You are thoroughly conversant of the opinion of the ratepayers as to the taxation in the county, are you not, through your newspaper?—Not entirely in the county, but I believe the ratepayers would be very slow to undertake, in the first instance, the very large sum that would be required to put Foynes in proper order for shipping purposes, and, next, to maintain it in that state; in fact, they would not have sufficient local interest in it, I believe, to encourage them to undertake any such responsibility. In point of fact, it is nearer through its railway communication with Limerick than with any of those places that have been named here, such as Rathkeel, Newcastle, and other towns that have been mentioned.

1417. You do not think that any of those towns would undertake to tax themselves to build a harbour or pier at Foynes?—From my knowledge of the taxation that they are under at present, and the distance they would be, I believe there would not be the remotest chance of their doing such a thing.

1418. Do you not think that it would serve those local towns that such a wealthy and strong body as your Limerick Harbour Commissioners should have the care and maintenance of this pier?—I believe it would serve and develop the whole district; there is no rivalry whatever between

5 May 1885.]

Mr. COUNIHAN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Synan—continued.

tween Foynes and Limerick. Limerick and Foynes are names that have always run together in connection with the interest of Foynes Harbour, and the quays of Limerick and the city of Limerick. In fact, the Limerick Harbour Board and the Corporation were the bodies that took the lead in promoting the establishment of a trans-Atlantic packet station at Foynes; surely it is common sense, if they were anxious to promote such a large enterprise as that at Foynes, there would be no such feelings of rivalry between them as have been stated here to prevail.

1419. Does not that feeling prevail generally at Limerick at this moment, if such an opportunity should arise?—Yes.

1420. The Limerick Harbour Board would use every exertion and every means it could control to establish such a station?—I believe that the Limerick Harbour Board have not the remotest intention of (to use an expression that has been made use of here) starving Foynes; on the contrary, their wish is to promote its interests in every possible way.

1421. What do you think about the difference between dredging and building this jetty or pier; do I understand you to prefer the building of a pier to dredging?—Of course, dredging would be a mere temporary expedient. I saw the place directly after it was dredged, when a very large sum had been expended upon it a few years ago, and it was just like cutting a groove in a sandy shore; the next tide almost began to undo the work they had been engaged in for months together. I may mention, that it was the Limerick Harbour Board that lent all the apparatus to the Board of Works to do that very dredging.

1422. It would not be your interest to carry into Limerick any freights that you could land at Foynes, for the purpose of the rural districts, provided that the freight was the same to Foynes as to Limerick?—I do not say that it would. One of our objects, with regard to Foynes, would be to get the deep water accommodation which we would have there, and, of course, every ton landed at Foynes would mean a development of labour there, and an extension of population. It is now the merest hamlet.

Mr. O'Sullivan.

1423. Is it not an analogous case to that of Passage?—I do not know anything about Passage.

Mr. Synan.

1424. You know as much about Queenstown and Passage, and Cork, and the relations they bear to each other, as any of us here; it does not hurt the trade of Queenstown, Passage, or Cork, that large vessels should sometimes discharge themselves at Passage?—On the contrary, I believe that it tends to their development.

1425. They advance each other?—They advance each other.

1426. If Foynes was made an auxiliary port to Limerick, instead of being in the starved condition in which it is now, would it not be an advantage to all parties?—Of course it would.

1427. Are you satisfied with the rates in the Schedule to the Bill?—As Mr. MacDonnell remarked, there are a number of articles taxed 0.89.

Mr. Synan—continued.

there that escape tolls, at Limerick they appear to be very moderate.

1428. Your harbour board has no intention of raising these rates in order to prejudice Foynes?—Not in the slightest degree; we have not considered such a matter at all as to increasing them.

1429. You would think rather of reducing them if it encouraged the trade?—I think they are pretty low as it is.

1430. But for the same goods at Limerick it appears from Mr. MacDonnell's evidence that you charge nothing at all?—Nothing at all.

1431. Therefore in that respect Foynes would have an advantage?—It has none according to the Bill.

1432. Do you know anything of the public opinion of the district, and of these local towns, as to whether they consider that Limerick would be the rival of Foynes?—I have heard that there have been some petitions adopted in those places, but there have been no public meetings and no protests that you could say represented the local opinions of those towns or localities.

1433. Judging from the evidence which has been given here to-day on behalf of the Limerick Harbour Board, as to its prosperity, and its income and its intentions, do you think that there is any prejudice in the minds of these local districts against your taking over the harbour?—I believe there is no prejudice against Limerick managing the harbour.

Mr. Lea.

1434. How far is it from Newcastle and Rathkeel to Foynes Pier, by road?—I do not know what is the exact distance, but I have driven it, and I should say it was about 10 miles.

Mr. O'Sullivan.

1435. Are you satisfied that your body, if they got the control of this pier, would fairly develop it?—Yes, I am quite satisfied that they would, and I think that if for a number of years past it had been under the control of the Limerick Harbour Board, they would have been devoting attention to it, and it would have been in quite a different condition from what it is now, and not only that, but I believe it would have been developed, if the local proprietors had given facilities as a place of residence in connection with the City of Limerick.

1436. Have you any ground for anticipating that they may neglect it so much that it may be worse than it is at present?—No, taking it at the worst, anything that is done for it should be for its improvement.

1437. Are you aware that it is an accommodation for Rathkeel, Newcastle, and this district round there, to have it opened?—Yes, it is to a certain extent, but I believe that it would afford much more accommodation if it were connected with the Harbour Board, and it would be their interest to facilitate the landing of portions of cargoes there.

1438. You know that it would be a great loss to this district at any time if it happened to be allowed to go into disuse, and if it were not properly attended to?—I take it, that whatever Act of Parliament was adopted would provide against any proceeding of that kind.

I

1439. Are

5 May 1885.]

Mr. COUNIHAN.

[Continued.]

Mr. O'Sullivan—continued.

1439. Are you satisfied that your body would not do that?—I am quite sure, that if we had it with the appliances that we have with our engineer, harbour master, and dredging apparatus of every description, we would keep the harbour in a state that would be creditable to ourselves, and a great advantage to everybody in the district.

Mr. Corry.

1440. You think that the traders in the towns between Foynes and Limerick, would be satisfied with the Limerick Harbour Commissioners having control of Foynes?—I can only answer that in a negative way, that we have never had any evidence to the contrary, and that the Harbour Board, as has been stated here already, have administered their affairs so satisfactorily, that I do not think it is possible that fault could be found with their management of this trust, and I believe, too, that they are before you with the best intentions towards Foynes.

1441. Of course it would be to the interest of the traders of Limerick; but I want to know if it would be to the interest of the traders in the towns between Limerick and Foynes?—I believe it would be very much to their interest in every possible way.

1442. Are you aware whether there is a difference between Cork, Queenstown, and Passage, which you have spoken of as to there being separate harbour boards in those ports?—Not in Queenstown; Queenstown has representatives on the Cork Harbour Board.

1443. And that is what you propose with regard to Foynes?—What we propose with regard to Foynes, as I gather the opinion of the Harbour Board, is that the importers and exporters should have the power of electing one representative on the Harbour Board.

Mr. O'Sullivan.

1444. That is to say, the men who are in the habit of exporting and importing?—I do not think that a mixed representation, such as has been stated here to-day, would work; you must have, you know, on a board of that kind, persons who are identified with the various shipping interests and with the harbour.

Mr. Corry.

1445. What is the number of the members of your board?—Seventeen.

Mr. Kenny.

1446. I only want to ask you whether in the event of the Limerick Harbour Board getting possession of Foynes Harbour, you would be prepared, not only to erect the T shaped jetty mentioned by Lord Montagu, and also by the Engineer of the Board of Works, but would you also be prepared to dredge Foynes Harbour and to keep it always in a proper state for small vessels?—I do not understand what you mean by a T shaped jetty; I suppose you mean to extend the present one and put something at right angles to it. That is an engineering ques-

Mr. Kenny—continued.

tion; but so far as that is concerned, I would be totally opposed to it. I think it would narrow, cramp, and interfere with Foynes Harbour at present, and I believe it would cause more silt than even now exists.

1447. Do you think that the keeping of the basin of the harbour constantly dredged would be quite sufficient to afford all the necessary accommodation for whatever is taken up?—Not at all; it would be only temporary; it would not even satisfactorily accommodate the 300 or 400 tons that go in. I think that if you meant to have proper accommodation for large vessels, you must have another pier.

1448. That is the one which you think the Limerick Harbour Board would be quite prepared to undertake?—Yes, to develop Foynes; I think that should be done at some future time.

Chairman.

1449. You stated that you thought the Harbour Board would have no objection to allowing a representative of the importers and exporters of Foynes; have you considered the question of allowing some representatives of the principal landowner of the district?—The Harbour Board have considered that.

1450. I suppose you are aware that a large sum has been contributed by the landowner to this pier, something like 4,000 £ out of 10,000 £?—I am aware of that.

1451. Looking at that, and at the interest which the principal landowner has in the development of the place and of the pier, have you considered whether it would be desirable to give him some representation, supposing it was transferred to the Limerick Harbour Board?—No, I do not think so; I think that was a speculation of Lord Montagu in the interest of his property; and as against a representation of that kind, the Harbour Board, if they got the custody of Foynes, would be taking a very large responsibility on their shoulders, and a very large amount of annual expenditure, and it would be generally for the interests of the community, but particularly for the interest of Lord Montagu's property; and it would be carrying out in a more active and efficient manner the original idea of Lord Montagu to make his property and the locality more valuable to himself. I may say that there is not the slightest rivalry of interest, and it has never occurred to me that there should be any between our interests and Lord Montagu's interests. We believe we are promoting them in every possible way in asking you to place the harbour within our control.

1452. And as I understand there would be no objection on the part of the Limerick Harbour Board to proper powers being introduced into the Act of Parliament which transferred the pier, in order to take care the pier is not allowed to go into a state of disuse or disrepair?—Not the slightest. Lord Montagu, as an importer himself, I dare say he would be the representative for Foynes, and we should be, of course, delighted to have his valuable assistance on our board.

5 May 1885.

Mr. MICHAEL GLYNN, re-called; and further Examined.

Mr. O'Shea.

1453. A LITTLE misapprehension has arisen with regard to one of your answers; you did not mean to convey, did you, that it would be agreeable to the inhabitants of Kilrush that there should be any representation of the board of guardians on the Harbour Board?—It would not be agreeable to the people of Kilrush that any member of the board of guardians should have any connection

Mr. O'Shea—continued.

with the scheme; but the pier should be invested in the town commission.

Mr. Keany.

1454. Let us quite understand. You wish that the complete control of the Cappa pier should be placed in the hands of town commissioners to be established?—Yes, exclusively.

The Right Honourable Lord MONTEAGLE, further Examined.

Chairman.

1455. I BELIEVE there is some point that you wish to add to your former evidence. Will you kindly state what it is?—It arises out of the evidence that has been offered by one or two of the witnesses from Limerick. I wish to point out one or two things. The case of Queenstown, Cork, and Passage has been mentioned as an analogous case, and I wish just to point out to the Committee that, in the first instance, Passage and Queenstown are within, I think, eight miles (Queenstown being the furthest) from Cork, whereas Foynes is 25 miles away from Limerick. Passage and Queenstown have both of them always been within the limits of Cork Harbour from the earliest times, and therefore, of course, Cork had every reason to exercise the authority when those places arose; but, notwithstanding those prescriptive rights, there have been difficulties between the different bodies, between Queenstown and Passage on the one side, and Cork on the other side. Then again last year Queenstown in order to protect its interest applied to Parliament to have a representation on the Cork Harbour Board. Then I have been told that so far from there being no difficulty between Passage and Cork, quite recently, owing to a change in the Cork Harbour Board, and a new board coming in, the Passage Docks were entirely deserted, and a large sum of money that had been expended there, by Sir John Arnott, was practically rendered useless when that new board came into office.

Mr. Keany.

1456. Is not Sir John Arnott a member of the present Cork Harbour Board?—Yes.

Chairman.

1457. Is there anything further that you wish to state?—The Mayor was asked by the Chairman whether he did not think that my predecessor's expenditure of 4,000 £, entitled the

Chairman—continued.

present owner to some consideration or representation in the matter, and I understood him to answer that he regarded it as a speculation which had failed, because the dues did not pay the expenses of the harbour. I wish to inform the Committee that neither my predecessor nor myself have ever had anything to do with the dues of the harbour, or the expenses of it, or with the profits.

1458. That is quite clear?—It was suggested by Mr. MacDonnell that if the harbour were vested in me as the trustee, I might sell it to some railway Company; of course that is quite out of the question, under the provisions of the Bill, because a trustee would be in the position of a trustee to the public, and he could not part with it in any way.

1459. Under the Bill it would not be invested in the trustee?—I do not know what the terms are; but at any rate it would not be his property, and he could not sell it. I understood Mr. Conibhan to state that the western site would be connected by railway, but I think that a glance at the chart would show that that would be a matter of great difficulty; there would have to be a great deal of filling; the old harbour would have to be filled up, I think. Mr. Conibhan and one or two other witnesses were asked as to the local opinion of the traders in these small country towns. If there is any doubt in the Committee's minds upon that point there are several witnesses willing to come over and give evidence about it, who are opposing its being transferred to the Limerick Harbour Board; if the Committee will take it from me that that opinion exists, I can vouch for it; but if they want any more direct evidence upon the matter, there are several representatives of the traders in these different towns who would come before them.

1460. As petitions have been presented from those towns, I think that will be sufficient?—Very well.

LIST OF APPENDIX.

Appendix, No. 1.

Paper handed in by Mr. C. F. Green, 28 April 1885:	PAGE.
Board of Public Works.—Shannon Navigation Act, 2 & 3 Vict. c. 61.—Quayage and	
Wharfage, Lower Shannon Pier, payable at Kilticery Pier - - - - -	69

Appendix, No. 2.

Paper handed in by Mr. C. F. Green, M. Inst. C.E., 2 May 1885:	
Lower Shannon Pier:	
Statement of Cost, and how Contributed - - - - -	70
Statement of Expenditure and Receipts - - - - -	70
Statement of Traffic in 1884 - - - - -	70

Appendix, No. 3.

Shannon Navigation Bill:	
Petition of the Grand Jury of the County of Limerick - - - - -	71
Petition of the Limerick Harbour Commissioners, praying to be heard by Counsel,	
Against - - - - -	71

A P P E N D I X.

Appendix, No. 1.

PAPER handed in by Mr. C. F. Green, 28 April 1885.

BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS.

SHANNON NAVIGATION ACT, 2 & 3 Vict. c. 61.

QUAYAGE AND WHARFAGE, LOWER SHANNON PIERS, payable at KILTERRY PIER.

	Rates for entering Pier.	
	1. For First Week.	2. For any Time after First Week.
I.—QUAYAGE.		
On Craft trading in the River Shannon:		
Open boats, turf boats, and decked vessels under 99 tons burden	3 d. per diem.	3 d. per diem.
Decked vessels of 99 tons and under 50 tons register, or 50 tons burden when not registered	1 s. " "	6 d. " "
Vessels of 50 tons register or burden, and under 100 tons register	2 s. " "	1 s. 6 d. "
Vessels of 100 tons register and upwards	3 s. " "	1 s. 8 d. "
On vessels arriving from or departing to any port in the United Kingdom outside the Shannon	8 d. per ton register for a period of 14 days.	½ d. per ton for every subsequent week or part of a week.
On vessels arriving from or departing to any foreign or colonial port	8 d. per ton register for a period of 14 days.	ditto.
Vessels arriving for the purpose of shelter to pay only the rates per diem or per ton as per Column No. 2.		

II.—WHARFAGE.

For Loading or Landing:

Turf, lime, limestone, building stone, flags, sand, gravel, ballast, marl, seaweed, and manures, ½ d. per ton.

Timber, coal, iron ores and minerals, corn, meal, malt, flour, potatoes, hay, straw, and all goods not elsewhere enumerated, 1½ d. per ton.

Pigs or sheep, 6 d. per store.

Horses or cattle, 1 d. per head.

Goods, &c., not removed from the pier within 48 hours, will be chargeable with half the above rates for each day or part of a day until removed.

No less a sum than 1 d. wharfage to be received in any case.

III.—EXEMPTIONS.

Fishing boats and small boats when not engaged in carrying goods or passengers.

Passengers' luggage and military stores.

Fuel for steamers, if carried direct on board without being laid on the quay.

Office of Public Works, Dublin,
27 January 1873.By Order,
Edward Horsey,
Secretary.

Appendix, No. 2.

PAPER handed in by Mr. C. F. Green, M. Inst. C.E., 2 May 1885.

LOWER SHANNON PIERS.

STATEMENT OF COST, and how Contributed.

NAME OF PIER.	Total Cost of Works.	Paid by			Name of Proprietors.
		Grant.	District.	Proprietors.	
	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	
Foyass - - -	16,603 15 4	3,303 18 11	- - -	4,000 15 5	Lord Montagu.
Kilbenny - - -	1,830 3 -	318 2 0	- - -	919 2 5	Earl of Clarn.
Salem - - -	1,810 18 4	321 5 10	- - -	504 12 5	R. E. Colles.
				185 - -	Representatives of M. Blacker.
				320 - -	Trinity College.
Quorra - - -	1,570 3 -	380 2 0	- - -	380 2 0	W. and R. Burrough.
Kilrush - - -	8,490 3 -	4,300 2 0	2,150 1 3	2,150 1 3	Cabriel Vandekerke.
Kilbysart - - -	1,380 5 -	1,384 3 4	552 1 8	- - -	
Clare Castle (old)	4,500 17 -	1,304 12 4	2,789 4 8	- - -	

STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURE AND RECEIPTS.

NAME OF PIER.	WORKS.		EXPENDITURE.			RECEIPTS.		
	Commenced.	Completed.	Since Completion to 31 December 1884.	1885 to 1884, both inclusive.	1884 only.	Since Completion to 31 December 1884.	1885 to 1884, both inclusive.	1884 only.
			£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
Foyass - - -	Nov. 1849	Autumn 1852	5,494 2 4	1,540 2 0*	125 10 8†	1,751 12 11	578 10 8	114 1 -
Kilbenny - - -	May 1841	July 1843	603 18 0	42 10 -	10 - -	160 11 4	2 4 0	- - -
Salem - - -	Oct. 1843	Sept. 1844	1,016 16 0	177 7 8	44 2 0	1,477 18 1	112 1 0	28 8 4
Quorra - - -	March 1842	Dec. 1842	771 2 1	58 - -	17 10 -	634 0 0	32 0 -	4 5 7
Kilrush - - -	July 1841	April 1845	3,452 1 2	355 4 4	08 3 0	5,059 18 1	899 2 0	102 7 5
Kilbysart - - -	Sept. 1841	Dec. 1842	1849 14 2	225 1 -	37 4 2	165 7 5	97 16 3	94 13 4
Clare Castle (old)	July 1843	Oct. 1845	1,349 8 -	490 6 10	130 4 3	4,070 15 4	1,425 0 7	274 12 2

* Including 1,794*l.* 1*s.* 1*d.* for docking during 1841 and 1842.† Including 55*l.* paid for compensation.

‡ Including cost of lock, trained gangway, and waiting room.

STATEMENT OF TRAFFIC in 1884.

NAME OF PIER.	No. of Vessels.	INWARDS.					OUTWARDS.					NATURE OF TRAFFIC.	
		Tonnage.	Cattle.	Horses.	Pigs.	Sheep.	Tonnage.	Cattle.	Horses.	Pigs.	Sheep.	Inwards.	Outwards.
Foyass - - -	200	7,042	-	-	-	-	1,708	-	-	-	-	Coal, timber, fish.	-
Kilbenny - - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Salem - - -	95	1,305	9	-	103	5	644	129	-	19	-	Coal, stone, pigs.	Ten. cattle.
Quorra - - -	95	4 -	-	-	-	-	618	-	-	-	-	-	Ten. cattle.
Kilrush - - -	*140	8,956	206	-	-	84	1,830	1,067	-	10,308	127	Coal, wheat, flour, &c.	Pigs, cattle.
Kilbysart - - -	*42	814	130	9	10	18	1234	193	11	1,348	484	Coal, &c.	Pigs, sheep.
Clare Castle (old)	*101	7,652	-	-	-	-	20,637†	-	-	-	-	Coal, timber, wheat, &c.	Stone.

* Exclusive of passenger steamer.

† Including 1,631 tons containing 18,639 tons of stone to "the Clare Harbour Works."

Appendix, No. 3.

SHANNON NAVIGATION BILL.

PETITION of the Grand Jury of the County of *Limerick*.

To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

The humble PETITION of the GRAND JURY of the County of LIMERICK,
assembled at Spring Assizes, 1885.

Sheweth,

THAT it is the opinion of the Grand Jury that the Shannon Navigation Bill is right in principle, but that it requires amendment in two important details, and pray that clauses be inserted in said Bill providing that,—

1. That when any pier or harbour shall be transferred to trustees, or to any county, or urban, or other authority, the Commissioners of Public Works who have heretofore received the tolls, and who were responsible for the maintenance of the pier or harbour, shall first place said pier or harbour in a proper state of repair.

2. That it shall not be lawful for the said Commissioners of Public Works to direct that such piers or harbours shall be so transferred as aforesaid, unless such county, trustees, or other authority shall first consent to undertake the maintenance of such piers or harbour under the provisions of the Acts relating thereto.

You Petitioners pray that your Honourable House will be pleased to give effect to their application.

And as in duty bound will ever pray.

Signed on behalf of the Grand Jury,

D. J. Roche, Foreman,
For Self and Fellows.

IN PARLIAMENT.—SESSION 1885.]

SHANNON NAVIGATION BILL.

PETITION praying to be heard by Counsel, Against.

To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland
in Parliament assembled.

The humble PETITION of the LIMERICK HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, under their
Common Seal.

Sheweth as follows—

1. A BILL (hereinafter called "the Bill") is now pending in your Honourable House, intitled "A Bill to make provision with respect to the maintenance of certain Piers and other Works in the Estuary of the River Shannon."

2. Your Petitioners were incorporated by an Act of Parliament of the 10th and 11th Victoria, chapter 198, by which Act all the powers, privileges, and authorities which had previously been vested in a body called "the Limerick Bridge Commissioners" under an Act of Parliament of the 10th George IV., chapter 94, were transferred to and vested in your Petitioners by the name of the "Limerick Harbour Commissioners," and your

Petitioners have since continued to exercise and still exercise all the powers conferred by the said Acts of Parliament, and such powers were confirmed and enlarged by the Limerick Harbour Act, 1867, by which Act your Petitioners were reconstituted.

3. Your Petitioners under the authority of the said Acts of Parliament have constructed an extensive system of quays, a floating dock, and a graving dock, with other important works in the city of Limerick, which have contributed much to the development of the trade and commerce of Limerick and the accommodation of vessels frequenting the Port of Limerick.

4. The money expended on the said works was advanced by the Treasury on the security of the harbour rates and dues payable to your Petitioners, and there is a large sum due to the Treasury on account of the said advances.

5. Your Petitioners under the aforesaid Acts of Parliament are now the pilotage authority for the River Shannon and its tributaries, extending from the mouth of the river to the city of Limerick, and they are the conservators of the rights of navigation along the said river, and the lighting and buoying on the said river are all under their control and management, save as to the lighthouses maintained by the Commissioners of Irish Lights.

6. By the said pending Bill (Clause 2) it is proposed that the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland shall have power from time to time, upon such conditions as with the consent of the Treasury they may think fit, by order, to commit the maintenance of any one or more of certain piers and harbours on the River Shannon below the city of Limerick (thereby including the pier and harbour of Foyunes) to any trustee or trustees willing to undertake the same, and by order to direct that any one or more of the said piers shall become the public property of the county, or of the urban or rural sanitary district in which each pier or piers is or are situate, and that the maintenance of the same shall be committed to the Grand Jury of the county or to such sanitary authority; and the said Bill (Clause 17) defines the local authority to mean the Grand Jury of a county, or any urban or rural sanitary authority within the meaning of the Public Health (Ireland) Act, 1876.

7. Your Petitioners humbly submit that if the said harbour of Foyunes, which is within the jurisdiction of your Petitioners, be transferred from the Commissioners of Works in Ireland, your Petitioners are the proper authority to receive and maintain the same, and that the clause in the Bill, so far as relates to the said harbour, should be amended accordingly, so as to authorize and direct the transfer to be made to your Petitioners. And they respectfully rely upon the following, as well as other grounds.

8. That having regard to the railway connection between Foyunes and Limerick, Foyunes should be regarded as contributory, and tributary, or auxiliary to the harbour of Limerick, and any division of interest or separation of management would be calculated to work prejudicially to both.

9. That the transfer of the said harbour to a railway company having the control of the line between Limerick and Foyunes would be objectionable, as they would or could be used by the railway company to the prejudice of public interests, and that for the same reason the transfer to a private individual or any independent company would be still more objectionable.

10. That Petitioners being still largely indebted to the Treasury for advances to the port, they submit that no transfer should be sanctioned by Parliament which would have the effect of diminishing the revenue of the port, thereby probably perilling the security of the Treasury, and compelling your Petitioners to increase the rates and dues, to the great prejudice of the trade of the district.

11. That of late years the rapidly increasing trade into the Port of Limerick has necessitated the employment of vessels of large capacity and great draught of water, and with the view of encouraging shipping of that class your Petitioners have in contemplation the deepening of the river up to the quays, and the enlargement of the docks.

12. In furtherance of that object they have had a survey and plan of the river and docks made at considerable expense by Sir John Cooke, and Captain Hall, R.N., who have made exhaustive reports on the points submitted to them.

13. The carrying into effect the extensive improvements which they have recommended, with others also necessary, will entail an expenditure of upwards of 70,000 £.

14. If your Petitioners were selected as the Local Authority to obtain the control and management of the said harbour, they believe they would be enabled to considerably reduce or probably avoid this large expenditure, as with some comparatively moderate alterations, Foyunes may be made largely auxiliary to the general interests to the river and Port of Limerick, besides being particularly benefited itself.

15. That your Petitioners having at their command a staff of officers with steam dredges and other plant and appliances requisite for harbour operations, could more effectually maintain and improve the harbour of Foyunes than any private individual or than any local authority contemplated by the Bill.

16. That

16. That if the said harbour be transferred to the Petitioners, and upon the altered conditions of the locality consequent on the increased accommodation of the harbour, the prosperity of the district would be much promoted, and there would be a great probability of Foynes becoming a place of considerable importance, and hold the same relation to Limerick as Queenstown and Kingstown bear to Cork and Dublin.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray your Honourable House that the said Bill may not pass into law as it now stands, but that it may be referred to a Select Committee, and that your Petitioners may be heard before such Committee by themselves, their Counsel, Agents, and Witnesses, against the Preamble of the said Bill, and in support of the insertion of such clauses and alterations therein and additions thereto, as they may think necessary for their protection.

WM. CARROLL,
Secretary.

Commissioners'
Corporate
Seal.

I N D E X.

[*N.B.*—In this Index the *Figures* following the Names of the Witnesses refer to the Questions in the Evidence; and those following *App.* to the Pages in the Appendix.]

B.

Bannatyne & Sons (Exrs and Liverick). Representations on the part of Messrs Bannatyne & Sons as to the great want of improved accommodation for ships at Clare Castle, and as to the alterations required in connection with the new pier, *Harris* 438 et seq.

Board of Trade. Proposal as to the local authorities in charge of harbours reporting to the Board of Trade instead of to the Board of Works in Dublin, *Lord Montagu* 1034-1036.

Special circumstances under which witness considers that the local authorities in charge of harbours should report to the Board of Trade, *Lord Montagu* 1316-1318.

Board of Works (Ireland). See *Board of Trade*. *Clare Castle*. *Foyes*. *Kilrush*. *Local Authorities*. *Transfer of Piers*.

Boorland's Rock (River Fergus). Danger owing to the refusal to place a beacon on Boorland's Rock, *Green* 410-412—Representation in letter from the Board of Works in August 1881 as to the want of a light on Boorland's Rock, *ib.* 847.

C.

Cappa Pier. See *Kilrush*.

CLARE CASTLE:

1. *Cost of Works.*
2. *Revenue and Expenditure.*
3. *Dues or Rates.*
4. *Old Quay.*
5. *New Pier; Explanations on the part of the Board of Works as to the Construction, and as to the Increased Cost through a Landslip.*
6. *Objections and Complaints respecting the New Pier, its Site, Construction, and present Condition.*
7. *New Structure recommended; Waste of Money in extending or re-constructing the New Pier.*
8. *Question of Dredging.*
9. *Question of Transfer of the Piers to a Local Authority; Suggestions as to its Constitution.*

1. *Cost of Works:*

Total cost of the works at Clare Castle; amount borne by Government and by the district, respectively, *Green* 27-32; *App.* 70.

Further particulars respecting the works at Clare Castle Old Quay in 1844-45, the cost having been 4,184 *l.*, of which 2,789 *l.* was contributed by the district and 1,394 *l.* was a free grant, *Green* 290-304.

Causes of the increase from 2,000 *l.* to 5,000 *l.* in the estimate for the new quay at Clare Castle, *Green* 308-315-348—Increase of estimate with a view to the works giving as much employment as possible during the winter, *ib.* 311—Probable increase of from 2,000 *l.* to 3,000 *l.* in the cost by taking the foundations down to the rock, *ib.* 353-356.

Statement that witness never heard the extension of works at the new pier was undertaken in order to give relief, *Harris* 451, 474-476.

CLARE CASTLE—continued.

2. Revenue and Expenditure :

Amount of receipts and expenditure during the whole period since the completion of the works, and in the years 1880 to 1884 inclusive; also amount of traffic and receipts in 1884 as compared with the expenditure, *Green* 35-37. 39. 52-57; *App.* 70.

Profit of 9,417 *l.* from Clare Castle Quay up to the end of 1884, *Green* 305-307.—Explanation that the revenue has been derived mainly from the old quay; very little use made of the new pier, *Harris* 515-517.

3. Dues or Rates :

Expediency of the rates or dues at Clare Castle being increased up to the level of the Limerick rates, and of the local authority being empowered to expend them in improving the navigation of the Peigue, *O'Connell* 572-591. 711. 721-723. 734-737. 780-784.

4. Old Quay :

Particulars respecting the works at the old pier; explanation that no repairs are required; and that there is no sitting, *Green* 14-16. 85. 145.

Application made on several occasions to the Board of Works for increased accommodation at Clare Castle, the people of Ennis and Clare having complained of the inadequate facilities at the old quay, *Harris* 447, 448. 545-553. 607-512.

Necessity of heavy expenditure if, instead of outlay on the new pier, it had been decided to deepen the river at the old quay, *O'Connell* 603-606.—Want of the old pier as well as the new pier for the accommodation of the different classes of vessels, *ib.* 716-719.

5. New Pier; Explanations on the part of the Board of Works as to the Construction, and as to the Increased Cost through a Landslip :

Information as to the works at the new pier; considerable difficulty in connection with the new quay, the works being still in progress, *Green* 14-16. 88-92. 145-155.—Cost and character of the excavations and works at the new pier and progress made with them; total expenditure of 7,033 *l.*, *ib.* 88-92. 145-155.

Examination in detail as to the landslip which occurred during the construction of the new pier at Clare Castle, the cause and effect thereof, and the reconstruction and increased cost entailed; belief that the slip was due to a land-spring and not to any defect in the plan of the works, *Green* 311. 316 *et seq.*—Explanation in connection with a report by General Sankey relative to the new works; reference especially to the plan of construction on wooden piles instead of carrying the foundations down to the solid rock, *ib.* 320 *et seq.*

Security against a landslip if the works had been founded on the solid rock, *Green* 333-338.—Conclusion that the weight of the masonry or concrete on the top of the piles had no effect in causing the landslip; effect, however, of a great weight of timber at the back of the pier, *ib.* 339-344.

Explanation respecting a second movement or slip, and the plans of Mr. Manning consequent thereon; increase thereby of the total cost to about 7,000 *l.*, *Green* 348-352. 367-369.

Further statement on the question of the landslip at Clare Castle New Quay having been partly induced by a large quantity of timber piled at the back of the pier; doubt as to the Board of Works having any responsibility in the matter, *Green* 348-359.

6. Objections and Complaints respecting the New Pier, its Site, Construction, and present Condition :

Local objections made at the time to the site selected for the new pier or quay, *Harris* 448. 450. 554.—Prediction, also, that the works would never succeed, the piles not having been driven deep enough, *ib.* 450. 556-557.—Impediments at the new pier, combined with obstructions in the river, so that vessels are deterred from coming to the pier, *ib.* 443-446.

Grounds for the statement that the new pier had not a proper foundation, and never was a perfect work, whilst it is now in a crumbling and dangerous state, *Harris* 505. 506. 511-514. 535-538. 599-606.—Repeated representations made to the Treasury and Board of Works as to the state of the new pier, *ib.* 507. 508.—Large increase expected in the trade of Clare Castle if the harbour be improved, and if certain impediments in the river be removed, *ib.* 545-554.

Omission in the Board of Works not having consulted local commercial men as to the site; question hereon as to the masters of fifteen vessels having been consulted, *Harris* 537. 538. 597. 598.—Considerable distance between the old pier and the new, *ib.* 541-544.—Use to be made of the old material or concrete blocks in rebuilding on a better foundation, *ib.* 561-573. 605. 606. 612.

Grounds

CLARE CASTLE—continued.

6. *Objections and Complaints respecting the New Pier, &c.—continued.*

Grounds for the conclusion that the failure of the new pier is owing to the selection of a foundation which is naturally bad, and to the piles resting upon mud, *O'Connell* 643-661. 667-669. 700-708. 718-733. 740-748. 772-776—Doubt as to any landslip having caused the failure of the works; reference hereon to the weight of a large quantity of timber stowed on the quay, *ib.* 651-653. 725-733. 773-776—Very unsafe state of the new pier structure at the present time; danger of its falling into the bed of the river, *ib.* 697-699. 785-787.

Decided opinion that the pier is a constant source of danger to the navigation, and may at any time fall into the river, *O'Connor* 794-796. 803—Conclusion that the failure of the pier is entirely due to defective foundations, and not to any landslip; the piles, in fact, were not driven sufficiently deep, *ib.* 797-810. 819-831. 840-842.

7. *New Structure recommended; Waste of Money in extending or re-constructing the New Pier.*

Perfectly useless character of the expenditure of 5,100*l.* already incurred, as well as of the additional 2,000*l.* proposed; examination in support of this view, witness submitting that it would be better to spend 2,000*l.* in taking down the present crumbling mass and in rebuilding upon a better foundation, *Harris* 452-456. 461. 483-473. 509-517. 558-573. 599-606—Expediency of the works being at once stopped; waste of money otherwise, *ib.* 454. 536—Permanent destruction to the navigation if the new pier be extended into the river, as proposed; want of increased width, on a better foundation, rather than of greater length, *ib.* 454. 456. 461. 558-573. 599. 600.

Difficulty in estimating the cost of the works required for remedying the defects of the new pier; preference for an entirely different site, and for a new work altogether, *O'Connell* 720. 740-771. 777-779—Explanation of the new structure contemplated by witness, he not having prepared any plan or estimate, nor considered the matter in detail, *ib.* 749-771. 777-779—Suggestion that a temporary wooden structure might be provided so as to accommodate vessels in deep water, *ib.* 784.

Perfect waste of money in trying to repair the pier; further failure anticipated, *O'Connor* 805. 806. 839-836—Opinion that the best plan would be to build a new pier higher up the river, which might be constructed in masonry for 2,000*l.*, *ib.* 836. 844-848—Advantage, for some years, of a wooden structure, or of an iron structure with screw piles; this should be at a new site, *ib.* 837-839.

8. *Question of Dredging.*

Necessity of dredging the estuary of the River Fergus if an increased depth of water be wanted; conclusion that there will be no silting up at the new quay, *Greene* 85-88. 146-153—Statement upon the question of the dredging of the river in front of the new pier; reference hereon to the large quantity of mud in the bed of the River Fergus, *ib.* 357-367.

Disapproval of expenditure on dredging as not meeting the requirement as to increased accommodation, *Harris* 496-498. 574. 575—Tendency of dredging in front of the new pier to render the foundations still more insecure; security if they had been taken down at first to the solid rock, *O'Connell* 664-669. 703-708. 733-740.

9. *Question of Transfer of the Piers to a Local Authority; Suggestions as to its Constitution.*

Question considered as to a local authority being liable for repayment of the sum of 7,000*l.* for the new works, and as to the revenue available for this and other purposes, *Greene* 493-496.

Decided objection to any local body undertaking charge of the pier in its present ruinous condition, or being liable for the charge of 7,000*l.* in respect of its original cost and proposed extension; the works should be handed over free of liability, *Harris* 455-476. 593-616—Suggestion that the members of the local body (if the pier be transferred free of liability) should be named by Parliament, conditionally upon their being representative commercial men of Clare Castle and Ennis, *ib.* 477-481. 500-504. 518-524. 539. 540. 613-618—Approval of Lord Inchiquin and Colonel Paterson, as the chief landed proprietors, being added to the proposed local body or harbour authority, *ib.* 484. 498-494. 620-622.

Difficulties as to the election of the local body by the Board of Guardians of Clare Castle or the Town Commissioners of Ennis, if reconstituted, *Harris* 486-488. 578-590. 630—Opinion that the local body should not be empowered to levy a rate for harbour purposes; sufficient revenue for meeting the expenditure, *ib.* 592-596—Further suggestions respecting the constitution or election of the local harbour body, *ib.* 613-622. 630. 631.

Suggestions for the constitution of the local body or harbour authority; proposed

CLARE CASTLE—continued.

9. *Question of Transfer of the Piers to a Local Authority, &c.*—continued.

proposed selection, in the first instance, of merchants and shippers of Ennis, *O'Connell* 670, 671. 718-719. 724.

Manifest injustice in transferring the pier to a local body, together with a charge of some 7,000 £, *O'Connor* 817.—Proposed constitution and mode of election of the local body to whom the piers (free of liability) might be transferred; there should be a great majority of importers and exporters of Ennis, *ib.* 818-824.—Approval of Lord Inchiquin and Colonel Paterson being members, *ib.* 826, 827.

See also *Ennis*.

Condition of Piers. Details respecting the several piers, seven in number, proposed to be dealt with by the Bill before the Committee, *Green* 1 et seq.—Very good state of repair of the piers generally, *ib.* 85.

Expediency of some provision as to the Board of Works putting the piers in proper order before transferring them, *Lord Montagu* 1034.

See also *Clare Castle*, 6. *Foynes*, 1. *Killadysert*. *Kilrush*. *Killerry*. *Querrin*. *Salva*.

Cost of Piers. Details as to the cost of the works in the case of each pier or harbour included in the Bill, and the amount of contribution by the districts, and by the proprietors interested, *Green* 18-32; *App.* 70.—See also *Clare Castle*, 1. *Foynes*, 6.

Cassidy, Jerome. (Analysis of his Evidence).—Witness is a member of the Limerick Harbour Board, having been twice elected from the Corporation; he is well acquainted with Foynes Harbour, 1395-1405.

Concurrence with Mr. Macdermott that Foynes Pier is in the wrong place, and that there should be a new pier to the westward, in connection with the railway, 1405-1412.—Very large vessels which could be accommodated if the proposed pier be extended into deep water, 1412-1414.

Grounds for the conclusion that no local body nor county authority could, with advantage, take over Foynes Harbour, 1415-1417.—Evidence strongly in favour of the harbour being transferred to the Limerick Harbour Board; facilities thereby for the development and administration of the harbour to the mutual advantage of Foynes and Limerick, 1418-1458.

Very temporary character of any improvement by dredging at Foynes, 1421. 1447.—Illustration in the case of Queenstown and Passage, as regards their relations with Cork, of the mutual advantage to Foynes and Limerick from the provision of a deep-water harbour at the former place; denial that there would be any injurious rivalry on the part of Limerick, 1423-1431. 1435-1448.—Advantage to the local towns as well as to Foynes by the proposed transfer; public feelings as these places on the subject, 1432-1441.

Approval of a representative of the traders of Foynes on the Limerick Harbour Board; Lord Montagu might be selected for this purpose, but the board would object to his direct representation as a landowner, 1442-1445. 1449-1452.—Decided objection to a certain alteration of the present pier, a new pier being essential for the accommodation of large vessels, 1446-1448.—Reference to the contribution to the cost of the present pier by a predecessor of Lord Montagu's as a speculation in the interest of the family property, 1451.

Courtown Harbour (Wexford). Reference to Courtown Harbour as having been handed over by the Board of Works to Lord Courtown, *Lord Montagu* 1016-1019.

D.

Dredging. Performance of all the dredging by one dredge, which is kept at Limerick, *Green* 108-111. 137-139.—Advantage if a dredger were available at Foynes and Kilrush without the cost of sending one from Limerick, *ib.* 242, 243. 267-271.

See also *Clare Castle*, 2. *Foynes*, 3.

Dues or Tolls. See *Rates*.

E.

Ennis. General feeling in Ennis that Clare Castle Harbour should be in charge of local commercial men; large population of Ennis as compared with Clare Castle, *Harri* 500-504. 595. 632, 633.

Ennis—continued.

Special importance attached by the shippers and merchants of Ennis to the improvement of the navigation of the River Fergus and the removal of obstructions, *O'Connell* 674-678. 683-691. 709-711.

See also *Clare Castle*.

Expenditure (Maintenance, &c.) Annual apportionment of the expenditure upon the several piers, *Green* 140-143.—More or less arbitrary course pursued in allotting the general expenditure between the different piers, *ib.* 423-435.

Statement of expenditure on the several piers in different periods, *App.* 70.

See also *Dredging*.

F.

Fergus River. Effect of the Clare Castle works is narrowing the bed of the river; width and depth of water available for vessels, *Green* 375-395.—Difficulties of the Fergus navigation, these not being directly involved in the question of Clare Castle Pier, *ib.* 409-415.

Advantage if the river as well as the port of Ennis were placed under the proposed local authority, and if the dues were equalised as compared with Limerick, *O'Connell* 672-691. 780-784.—Greater importance of expenditure in the removal of obstructions to the navigation than on the new pier at Clare Castle; direct representation by witnesses of shippers and merchants of Ennis to the foregoing effect, *ib.* 674-678. 683-691. 709-711.

Letter from the Board of Works, dated 8th August 1881, respecting the navigation of the River Fergus, and the want of a light on Boerland Rock, &c., *Green* 847.

See also *Clare Castle*.

Foundation of Piers. Objection to wooden foundations for piers under such local circumstances as at Clare Castle, *O'Connell* 788.—See also *Clare Castle*, 4, 9.

FOYNES :

1. *Site of the Pier and Condition of the Works ; Suggestions as to the Site and Character of the New Works to be carried out.*
2. *Small Vessels now accommodated, and small Local Trade ; great Development expected.*
3. *Silt and Dredging.*
4. *Question of Transfer to a Local Authority, to Lord Montagu, to the Limerick Harbour Board, or the Waterford and Limerick Railway Company.*
5. *Cost of Works ; Receipts and Expenditure.*
6. *Rates or Dues.*

1. *Site of the Pier and Condition of the Works ; Suggestions as to the Site and Character of the New Works to be carried out :*

Several authorities by whom Foynes was recommended as a site for a harbour, the works having been commenced in 1846, and the pier and breakwater having been completed in 1850, *Green* 6. 10.—Estimates in 1881 for a timber jetty from the pier-head; want of funds for carrying out this work, *ib.* 10. 71-75. 189.

Details respecting the present condition of the works at Foynes, with suggestions as to the improvements and extensions required; more effectual work and less cost on the whole by providing a wooden jetty than by constant dredging, *Green* 58-78. 120-136. 158 et seq.—Avoidance of the difficulty as to silt in the harbour by extending the pier into deep water; considerable cost involved, *ib.* 76-78.—The pier is now in working order, save that vessels cannot come into the inner harbour at low water, *ib.* 126-129.

Proposed extension of the pier into deep water, the cost being estimated at about 5,000 £, *Lord Montagu* 1000-1003. 1043-1045. 1060-1064. 1084. 1098. 1104.—Fairly good state of the pier at the present time, *ib.* 1049.

Explanation respecting the site originally chosen for Foynes Harbour; its advantages and disadvantages as compared with the site eventually chosen, *Lord Montagu* 1222-1236.—Large outlay entailed by the extension of the pier, this not affecting the silt already in the harbour, *ib.* 1311-1314.

Opinion that extended accommodation at Foynes could best be provided at the original site named at the time of the Commission of 1851, *Maddisall* 1342-1344.

FOYNES—continued.

1. *Site of the Pier and Condition of the Works, &c.*—continued.

Concurrence with Mr. Mardemott that the pier is in the wrong place, and that there should be a new pier to the westward, in connection with the railway, *Cowlishan* 1405-1412.—Decided objection to a certain alteration of the present pier, a new pier being essential for the accommodation of large vessels, *ib.* 1445-1448.

2. *Small Vessels not accommodated, and small Local Trade: great Development expected:*

Depth of water at Foynes for vessels from 200 to 300 tons, *Green* 230-232, 233-238.—Advantage of the railway between Foynes and Limerick as regards the development of the former, *ib.* 275-279.

Small population and business at Foynes; development expected if the harbour be improved, *Lord Montagu* 996, 1053-1057, 1075, 1085-1107.—Commercial and shipping advantages of Foynes as compared with Limerick in the event of Foynes Harbour being sufficiently extended, *ib.* 1074-1080, 1088-1092, 1095-1105.

Report by a Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1851 in favour of Foynes as a trans-Atlantic packet station; very moderate outlay required for the purpose, *Lord Montagu* 1093, 1100.—Very large vessels which could come to Foynes if the pier be extended; small boats now using the harbour, *Lord Montagu* 1102-1104; *O'Mara* 1136-1143, 1150-1155; *Cowlishan* 1412-1414.

Further statement as to the small trade of the place, only one person, Mr. Walsh, doing a large business, *Lord Montagu* 1205-1206, 1300-1306.—Doubt as to American liners or mail packets being induced to come to Foynes, *ib.* 1268-1273.—Increased tonnage of vessels to be accommodated according to the length of the extension, *ib.* 1315-1317.

3. *Silt and Dredging:*

Gradual silting up of Foynes Harbour, dredging having become necessary in 1860-61, and again in 1881-82; expenditure of 1,174 £ in the latter year, *Green* 10, 58, 70.

Particulars with further reference to the accumulation of silt and the decreased depth at Foynes Harbour, and the extent and cost of the dredging operations; total expenditure of 1,700 £ for dredging since the construction of the pier forty years ago, *Green* 120-125, 156-178, 206-231.—Examination as to the progress made in the accumulation of silt in the harbour in connection with the amount and cost of the dredging to be carried out by the local authority, if the pier be transferred to them, *ib.* 168-180, 245-252.

Large outlay necessary if dredging be carried out, witness submitting that this is so much money thrown away, *Lord Montagu* 1004, 1041-1048, 1081-1083, 1098.—Deposit of silt at the end of the pier since the last dredging three years ago, *ib.* 1041.—Saving feasible on the score of dredging, whereby the expenditure might be reduced to the level of the receipts; uselessness of the dredging hitherto, *ib.* 1307-1310.

Very temporary character of any improvement by dredging, *Cowlishan* 1431, 1447.

4. *Question of Transfer to a Local Authority, to Lord Montagu, to the Limerick Harbour Board, or the Waterford and Limerick Railway Company:*

Doubt as to the local sanitary authority or the county being prepared to take over Foynes Harbour, in view of the cost to be incurred in dredging, *Green* 120-122, 186-192, 242, 243.—Question considered whether the Limerick Harbour Board might not be entrusted with Foynes pier; interest of the board in the navigation of the Shannon, *ib.* 192-202, 263.

Witness is owner of all the land within a mile of Foynes harbour, whilst his grandfather contributed some 4,000 £ towards the construction of the works, *Lord Montagu* 983-990, 1054.—The harbour has never been the smallest benefit to witness or his predecessors, *ib.* 991.

Grounds for the conclusion that the harbour could not be transferred with advantage to the county authority or any local authority; that is, on account mainly of the difficulty as to funds for its improvement and maintenance, *Lord Montagu* 992-999, 1050-1052, 1065, 1085.

Willingness of witness to take over the harbour from the Board of Works (though he would prefer that some local authority did so), and to expend money in developing it; necessary benefit thereby to the locality generally as well as to himself, *Lord Montagu* 996 1003, 1016-1020, 1080-1084, 1093-1097, 1106, 1107.

Evidence adverse to the transfer of the harbour to the Limerick Harbour Board; apprehension that Foynes would not thereby be sufficiently developed as a commercial harbour, as it would be a rival port to Limerick, *Lord Montagu* 1006-1011, 1021-1023, 1047, 1073, 1085-1092.

Objection

FOYNES—continued.

4. *Question of Transfer to a Local Authority, &c.—continued.*

Objection also to the harbour being vested in the Waterford and Limerick Railway Company; doubt as to their being prepared to find the necessary capital for its extension, *Lord Montagu* 1019, 1058, 1059.

Disapproval of the harbour being vested in a body comprising witness and representatives of the Limerick Harbour Board and the Railway Company; difficulty in such body raising money on security of the harbour dues or otherwise, *Lord Montagu* 1013-1015.—Objection to a local body (not a public authority) comprising representatives of different classes and interests; difficulty as to their raising the funds required for extending the pier, *ib.* 1065-1071.—Feeling of the traders in favour of an independent authority, *ib.* 1072, 1073.

Evidence strongly in favour of Foynes Harbour being transferred to the Limerick Harbour Board, rather than to Lord Montagu; denial that the board would be actuated by any feeling of rivalry, it being to the interest of Limerick to develop the trade of Foynes as an auxiliary port, *O'Mara* 1114 *et seq.*—Benefit to Limerick, as well as to Foynes, if the latter port were developed into a trans-Atlantic packet station, *ib.* 1121-1125.—Benefit to the small towns in the vicinity by the improvement of Foynes, *ib.* 1202-1204.

Objection to Lord Montagu being, in view of his local interests, represented on the body to whom the harbour is transferred; approval of a representation of the importers and exporters of Foynes, *O'Mara* 1205, 1207.—Improvement of Lord Montagu's property if the harbour and port be developed by the action of the Limerick Harbour Board, *ib.* 1213-1215.

Conclusion as to the development of the harbour and trade of Foynes being necessarily a benefit to witness as owner of the adjoining lands, *Lord Montagu* 1237-1245.—Opinion further expressed as to the unfitness of the local sanitary authority to take charge of the harbour, and to raise money for its improvement, *ib.* 1251, 1252, 1259, 1260, 1297.

Concurrence in the view that the Board of Works should put the harbour into good repair before it is handed over, *Lord Montagu* 1253-1255.—Agreement also in the view that it should be optional in the local authority to undertake the maintenance of the pier, *ib.* 1256.

Doubt whether the county of Limerick have been asked or have declined to take over the harbour, *Lord Montagu* 1257-1258.—Property other than land which witness might desire to offer as collateral security for the money required, *ib.* 1261.

Further examination in support of witness' objection to the harbour being placed under the Limerick Harbour Board; interest of the latter under certain circumstances in not sufficiently developing it, *Lord Montagu* 1262 *et seq.*—Exception taken to a proposal that Foynes might have a representative at the harbour board, *ib.* 1298-1306.—Explanation that any land required for the extension of the harbour is already in the possession of witness, *ib.* 1318-1323.

Conclusion that it would be an advantage to Limerick as well as to Foynes, if large ships could discharge, or partly discharge, at the latter harbour; denial that there could be any rivalry between the two places, or any injury to the trade of Foynes, if the new pier were under the Limerick Harbour Board, *Macdonnell* 1345 *et seq.*—Unanimous desire of the Limerick Harbour Board to take charge of Foynes Harbour, and to develop it in the interest of Foynes as well as of Limerick; ample funds available for new works, and for maintenance, *ib.* 1349 *et seq.*

Advantage to the small local towns by the development of Foynes by the Harbour Board of Limerick, *Macdonnell* 1350-1357.—Approval of Foynes having one or two representatives at the Limerick Harbour Board, if the proposed transfer be carried out, *ib.* 1371, 1372.—Belief that there is no local body to take charge of the harbour, *ib.* 1385.

Objection to its transfer to a private individual, though Lord Montagu may be desirous to do all that is required; his successor might sell the pier to the railway company, *Macdonnell* 1385, 1386.—Non-objection to a clause in the Bill, providing that the works at Foynes shall not be allowed to get into disrepair, *ib.* 1394, 1395.

Grounds for the conclusion that no local body nor county authority could, with advantage, take over Foynes Harbour, *Countess* 1415-1417.—Evidence strongly in favour of the harbour being transferred to the Limerick Harbour Board; facilities thereby for the development and administration of the harbour to the mutual advantage of Foynes and Limerick, *ib.* 1415-1448.

Illustration in the case of Queenstown and Passage, as regards their relations with Cork, of the mutual advantage to Foynes and Limerick from the provision of a deep-
189. L 4 water

*Foynes—continued.*4. *Question of Transfer to a Local Authority, &c.—continued.*

water harbour at the former place; denial that there would be any injurious rivalry on the part of Limerick, *Committee* 1429-1431. 1435-1448.—Benefit to the local towns as well as to Foynes by the proposed transfer; public feelings in these places on the subject, *ib.* 1432-1441.

Approval of a representative of the traders of Foynes on the Limerick Harbour Board; Lord Montagu might be selected for this purpose, but the Board would object to his direct representation as a landowner, *Committee* 1442-1445. 1449-1452.—Reference to the contribution to the cost of the present pier by a predecessor of Lord Montagu's as a speculation in the interest of the family property, *ib.* 1451.

Statement purporting to show there is no analogy between the case of Foynes and Limerick, and that of Queenstown, Passage, and Cork, as regards the question of the transfer of Foynes Harbour to the Limerick Harbour Board, *Lord Montagu* 1455, 1456.

Explanation in reply to a statement as to the speculative character of the contribution to Foynes pier by witness' predecessor, *Lord Montagu* 1457.—Inaccuracy of a statement as to the possible transfer of the pier to a railway company, if it were vested in witnesses, *ib.* 1458, 1459.—Decided feeling in the local towns adverse to transfer to the Limerick Harbour Board, *ib.* 1459, 1460.

Reasons urged in petition from the Limerick Harbour Commissioners in favour of the proposed transfer, *App.* 71-73.

5. *Cost of Works; Receipts and Expenditure:*

Total cost of the works; proportion paid by grant and by the local proprietors, *Green* 18-23; *App.* 70.

Amount of receipt and expenditure during the whole period since the completion of the works, and in the years 1880 to 1884 inclusive; also amount of traffic and receipts in 1884, as compared with the expenditure, *Green* 36. 39. 40*-45; *App.* 70.

Items other than dredging included in the total expenditure of 125 £ in respect of the harbour in 1884; average annual expenditure and receipts for the last five years, *Green* 428, 429, 431, 432.

6. *Rates or Dues:*

Very low rates as regards Foynes in the schedule of the proposed Bill, *Lord Montagu* 1037.

Relative dues or rates at Limerick and at Foynes; it is not proposed to raise the charges for the use of Foynes Harbour, when improved, *Macdonnell* 1359-1366.

See also Curators. Limerick.

G.

Glynn, Michael. (Analysis of his Evidence).—Witness, who is a merchant at Kilsalis, is well acquainted with Capps Pier, 860-862.—The pier is in very fair condition, and if it were extended about 240 feet towards Hog Island a large number of vessels could be accommodated; entire facility of such extension, 863-865. 977-982.—The pier is under the management of the Board of Works; complaint as to the favouritism shown by them to steamers of the Waterford Steamship Company and the Lower Shannon Steamship Company, 866 *et seq.*

Statement as to witness having been precluded from landing a cargo of grain at the pier on account of the preference shown to a steamer already at the pier, 875-878. 901*-911.—Grounds for complaint as to the rates charged to steamers frequently using the pier in comparison with the charges upon casual vessels, 879, 880. 912-915. 929, 930. 941-948.—Non-objection to the schedule of rates in the present Bill, 881, 882. 926-928.

Suggestions as to the constitution of the local body to whom the management of the pier should be transferred by the Board of Works; the town commissioners, if established, would be competent for the purpose, and there might be one or two representatives from the board of guardians, 883-899. 931-946. 967-964.—Objection to the exclusive use of the pier by the steamship companies as giving them a monopoly of trade; statement hereon as to the depth of water at different parts of the pier, 900-925. 969-972.

Influential representations made to the Board of Works as to the want of better accommodation for local traders, without exclusive privileges to the steamboat companies; willingness of the Board to transfer the management to a local body, 916. 953-956. 965-968.—

Glyn, Michael. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—continued.

908—Decided want of an extension of the pier and the quay space; great local advantage by extension into deep water, 950-953. 969-972. 977-982.—Desire of Mr. Vandelaar, the principal landowner, for an extension of the pier; doubt whether he would be disposed to act as trustee, 973-976.

[Second Examination.]—Explanation that a representation of the board of guardians of Killybeg in the management of the Cappa Pier would be objected to, it being proposed to vest the pier entirely in the new town commissioners, 1453, 1454.

Government Grants. Amount of Government grant in the case of each pier, *App.* 76.

Grand Jury (Limerick). Petition of the grand jury of the county of Limerick, praying for an amendment of the Bill on certain points, *App.* 70.

Green, Charles Frederick. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Witness, who is assistant engineer to the Board of Works in Ireland, submits various details respecting the several piers, seven in number, proposed to be dealt with by the Bill before the Committee, *et seq.*

Several authorities, by whom Foynes was recommended as a site for a harbour, the works having been commenced in 1846, and the pier and breakwater having been completed in 1850; 6. 10—Appropriation of 584,407 *l.* for Shannon improvements by the Act 2 & 3 Vict. in 1839; principle of joint contribution by the Government, the counties, and the local proprietors, 6-10.

Gradual silting up of Foynes Harbour, dredging having become necessary in 1860-61, and again in 1881-82; expenditure of 1,174 *l.* in the latter years, 10. 58-70—Estimates in 1881 for a timber jetty from Foynes pier-head; want of funds for carrying out this work, 10. 71-75. 82-9.

Commencement in May 1841 and completion in July 1842 of the Kiltarry Pier works; parapet added at the land end of the pier in 1844; 10—Situation of Salses Pier or quay, the works having been completed in 1844-45; the pier can only be approached by boats after half-tide, 58—Commencement and completion in 1842 of Querrin pier, which is situated on the north side of the Shannon estuary, 10, 11.

Situation of Kilrush pier opposite the Scatterry Roads, the works which were commenced in 1841 not having been completed till 1845; further works from time to time, 12—Estimates in 1880 for lengthening Kilrush Pier, at a cost of 8,000 *l.*, this not having been carried out, 12-14.

Particulars respecting the pier at Killadysert, which was completed in December 1842; subsequent works added, 14—Information as to the works at Clare Castle old quay and new quay, respectively; considerable difficulty in connection with the new quay, the works being still in progress, 14-16. 88-92.

Details as to the cost of the works in the case of each pier or harbour included in the Bill, and the amount of contribution by the districts and by the proprietors interested, 18-32; *App.* 70—Information respecting the receipts and expenditure in each case for the whole period since the completion of the works to the end of 1884, for the five years 1880-84, and for the year 1884, separately, 33-57; *App.* 70—Amount of traffic and of receipts as compared with the expenditure in 1884; 40-57; *App.* 70.

Further details respecting the condition of the works at Foynes, with suggestions as to the improvements and extensions required; more effectual work and less cost on the whole, by providing a wooden jetty than by constant dredging, 58-78. 120-138. 158 *et seq.*—Avoidance of the difficulty as to silt in Foynes Harbour by extending the pier into deep water; considerable cost involved, 76-78.

Requirement of some slight repairs at Kiltarry Pier; disuse into which this pier has fallen, no tolls being now collected, 79, 80—Very limited extent to which any repairs are required at Salses Pier, 81-83—Inexpensive repairs required at Querrin Pier, the estimated cost being 15 *l.*; 84.

Summary of the repairs wanted at Kilrush, the cost being estimated at 160 *l.*; 84—Requirement of repairs at Killadysert, at a cost of 15 *l.*; want also of a new bulk or floating stage, the estimated cost being about 500 *l.*; 84, 85.

Explanation that at Clare Castle old quay, no repairs are required; there is no silting, 85, 145—Necessity of dredging the estuary of the River Fergus if an increased depth of water be wanted; conclusion that there will be no silting up at the new quay, 85-88. 146-153—Very good state of repair of the piers generally, 86—Further reference to the character of the excavations and works at Clare Castle new pier, and the progress made with them; total expenditure of 7,033 *l.*; 88-92. 145-155.

Explanation respecting the rates or tolls charged for the use of the piers, these being similar to the tolls in the schedule to the present Bill, 93-99—Different piers proposed to be transferred to the counties or to local authorities, 100-132—Limited extent to 183. M which

Green, Charles Frederick. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

which there is silting up at Kilrush pier, 104-107. 144—Performance of all the dredging by one dredger, which is kept at Limerick, 108-111. 137-139.

Circumstances under which reduced tolls are chargeable in the case of a steamer which calls continuously at Kilrush, 112-119—Condition of Foynes Harbour and cost of dredging advocated to in connection with its proposed transfer to a local authority; the pier is now in working order, save that vessels cannot come into the inner harbour at low water, 120-129—Annual apportionment of the expenditure upon the several piers, 140-143.

Particulars with further reference to the accumulation of silt and the decreased depth at Foynes Harbour, and the extent and cost of the dredging operations; total expenditure of 1,700 £ for dredging since the construction of the pier forty years ago, 156-178. 205-232.—Examination as to the progress made in the accumulation of silt in the harbour in connection with the amount and cost of the dredging to be carried out by the local authority, if the pier be transferred to them, 178-185. 246-252.

Doubt as to the local sanitary authority or the county being prepared to take over Foynes Harbour, in view of the cost to be incurred in dredging, 186-192. 242-243—Question considered whether the Limerick Harbour Board might not be entrusted with Foynes Pier; interest of the Board in the navigation of the Shannon, 192-200. 263—Opinion that it may be left to the Board of Works to arrange as to the bodies to whom the piers are transferred, acceptance of the trust being voluntary, 199-205. 272-274.

Depth of water at Foynes for vessels from 200 to 300 tons, 230-232. 253-258—Advantage if a dredger were available at Foynes and Kilrush without the cost of sending one from Limerick, 242, 243. 267-271—Much larger vessels which can discharge at Limerick than at Foynes, 259-262—Reduced rates payable by steamboats constantly using the piers on the Shannon, 264-266—Advantage of the railway between Foynes and Limerick as regards the development of the former, 275-279.

Belief that funds were not available for the extension of Kilrush Pier as proposed in 1880 at a cost of 8,000 £; 180-182—Doubt as to the expenditure incurred in dredging at Kilrush, 283-288.

Further particulars respecting the works at Clare Castle Old Quay in 1844-45, the cost having been 4,184 £, of which 2,789 £ was contributed by the district, and 1,394 £ was a free grant, 290-304—Profit of 2,417 £ from Clare Castle Quay up to the end of 1884; 305-307—Cause of the increase from 2,000 £ to 5,000 £ in the estimate for the new quay at Clare Castle, 308-315. 348.

Examination in detail as to the landslip which occurred during the construction of the new pier at Clare Castle, the cause and effect thereof, and the re-construction and increased cost entailed; belief that the slip was due to a landsliding and not to any defect in the plan of the works, 311. 316 et seq.—Explanations in connection with a Report by General Sanky relative to the Clare Castle new works; reference especially to the plan of construction on wooden piles instead of carrying the foundations down to the solid rock, 320 et seq.

Severity against a landslip if the works at Clare Castle had been founded on the solid rock, 333-338—Conclusion that the weight of the masonry or concrete on the top of the piles had no effect in causing the landslip; effect, however, of a great weight of timber at the back of the pier, 339-346—Explanation respecting a ground movement or slip, and the plans of Mr. Manning consequent thereon; increase thereby of the total cost to about 7,000 £; 348-362. 367-404—Probable increase of from 2,000 £ to 3,000 £ in the costs by taking the foundations down to the rock, 363-371—Statement upon the question of the dredging of the river in front of the new pier; reference hereon to the large quantity of mud in the bed of the River Fergus, 357-367.

Effect of the Clare Castle works in narrowing the bed of the river; width and depth of water available for vessels, 375-395—Question considered as to a local authority being liable for repayment of the sum of 7,000 £ for the new works, and as to the revenue available for this and other purposes, 403-406—Difficulties of the Fergus navigation, these not being directly involved in the question of Clare Castle Pier, 409-415—Danger owing to the refusal to place a beacon on Boorland's Rock, 410-412.

Items other than dredging included in the total expenditure of 185 £ in respect of Foynes Harbour in 1883; average annual expenditure and receipts for the last five years, 428, 429. 431, 432—More or less arbitrary course pursued in allotting the general expenditure between the different piers, 433-435.

[Second Examination.]—Letter from the Board of Works, dated 8th August 1881, respecting the navigation of the River Fergus, and the want of a light on Boorland

Green, Charles Frederick. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—continued.

Rock, &c., 847.—Approval in the foregoing letter of a transference of the piers and harbours in the Lower Shannon to the local authorities, *ib.*

Further statement on the question of the landslip at Clare Castle new quay having been partly induced by a large quantity of timber piled at the back of the pier, doubt as to the Board of Works having any responsibility in the matter, 848-859.

H.

Harris, Henry Bradshaw. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Witness is manager for Messrs. Bonmatyue and Sons, of Ennis and Limerick; very large business of the firm, Clare Castle Quay being much used by their vessels, 438-442.

Impediments at Clare Castle new pier, combined with obstructions in the river, so that vessels are deterred from coming to the pier, 443-446.—Applications made on several occasions to the Board of Works for increased accommodation at Clare Castle, the people of Ennis and Clare having complained of the inadequate facilities at the old quay, 447, 448. 545-553. 567-618.—Local objections made at the time to the site selected for the new pier or quay, 449, 450. 554.—Prediction also that the works would never stand, the piles not having been driven deep enough, 450. 555-557.

Statement that witness never heard the extension of works at the new pier was undertaken in order to give relief, 451. 474-476.—Perfectly useless character of the expenditure of 5,000 £ already incurred, as well as of the additional 2,000 £ proposed; examination in support of this view, witness submitting that it would be much better to spend 2,000 £ in taking down the present crumbling mass, and in re-building upon a better foundation, 452-458. 461. 469-473. 509-517. 558-573. 599-606.—Expediency of the works being at once stopped; waste of money otherwise, 454. 538.

Permanent obstruction to the navigation if the new pier be extended into the river, as proposed; want of increased width, on a better foundation, rather than of greater length, 454, 455. 461. 565-573. 599, 600.—Decided objection to any local body undertaking charge of the pier in its present ruinous condition, or being liable for the charge of 7,000 £, in respect of its original cost and proposed extension; the works should be handed over free of liability, 455-476. 523-526.

Suggestion that the members of the local body (if the pier be transferred free of liability) should be named by Parliament, conditionally upon their being representative commercial men of Clare Castle and Ennis, 477-491. 500-504. 518-524. 539, 540. 613-618.—Approval of Lord Inchiquin and Colonel Paterson, as the chief landed proprietors, being added to the proposed local body or harbour authority, 484. 492-494. 580-592.—Difficulties as to the election of the local body by the board of guardians of Clare Castle, or the town commissioners of Ennis, if re-constituted, 486-488. 576-580. 630.

Disapproval of expenditure on dredging, as not meeting the requirement as to increased accommodation, 495-498. 574, 575.—General feeling in Ennis that Clare Castle Harbour should be in charge of local commercial men; large population of Ennis as compared with Clare Castle, 500-504. 526, 530, 533.—Grounds for the statement that the new pier had not a proper foundation, and never was a perfect work, whilst it is now in a crumbling and dangerous state, 505, 506. 511-514. 536-538. 599-606.

Repeated representations to the Treasury and Board of Works as to the state of the new pier, 507-508.—Explanation that the revenue has been derived mainly from the old quay; very little use made of the new pier, 515-517.—Large increase expected in the trade of Clare Castle if the harbour be improved, and if certain impediments in the river be removed, 525-534.

Omission in the Board of Works not having consulted local commercial men as to the site; question hereon as to the masters of fifteen vessels having been consulted, 537, 538. 597, 598.—Considerable distance between the old pier and the new, 541-544.—Use to be made of the old material or concrete blocks in re-building on a better foundation, 561-573. 605, 606. 839.

Opinion that the local body should not be empowered to levy a rate for harbour purposes; sufficient revenue for meeting the expenditure, 592-598.—Further suggestions respecting the constitution or election of the local harbour body, 613-622. 630, 631.

K.

Killadysart. Particulars respecting the pier at Killadysart, which was completed in December 1842; subsequent works added, *Green 14*—Total cost of works; amount borne by Government and by the district respectively, *Green 27; App. 70*.

Amount of receipt and expenditure during the whole period since the completion of the works, and in the years 1880 to 1884 inclusive; also, amount of traffic and receipts in 1884 as compared with the expenditure, *Green 35-39, 49-52; App. 70*—Requirement of repairs at Killadysart at a cost of 16 £; want also of a new hulk or floating stage, the estimated cost being about 200 £; *Green 84, 85*.

Kilrush. Situation of Kilrush Pier opposite the Scattery Roads, the works which were commenced in 1841 not having been completed till 1845; further works from time to time, *Green 12*—Estimates in 1880 for lengthening Kilrush Pier, at a cost of 8,000 £, this not having been carried out, *ib. 12-14*.

Total cost of works; proportion borne by grant, by the district, and by Colonel Vandeleur, *Green 26, 27; App. 70*—Amount of receipt and expenditure during the whole period since the completion of the works, and in the years 1880 to 1884 inclusive; also amount of traffic and receipts in 1885 as compared with the expenditure, *Green 35-39, 48, 49; App. 70*.

Summary of the repairs wanted at Kilrush, the cost being estimated at 160 £, *Green 84*—Limited extent to which there is silting up at the pier, *ib. 104-107, 144*—Circumstances under which reduced tolls are chargeable in the case of a steamer which calls continually at Kilrush, *ib. 112-113*.

Belief that funds were not available for the extension of the pier as proposed in 1880 at a cost of 8,000 £, *Green 280-282*—Doubt as to the expenditure incurred in dredging, *ib. 283-288*.

Cappa Pier at Kilrush is in very fine condition, and if it were extended about 240 feet towards Hogg Island a large number of vessels could be accommodated; entire facility of such extension, *Glynn 863-865, 977-982*—The pier is under the management of the Board of Works; complaint as to the favoritism shown by them to the steamers of the Waterford Steam Ship Company, and the Lower Shannon Steam Ship Company, *ib. 806 et seq.*

Statement as to witness having been precluded from landing a cargo of grain at the pier on account of the preference shown to a steamer already at the pier, *Glynn 876-878, 901-911*—Grounds for complaint as to the rates charged to steamers frequently using the pier in comparison with the charges upon casual vessels, *ib. 879, 880, 912-915, 929, 930, 941-942*—Non-objection to the schedule of rates in the present Bill as regards Kilrush, *ib. 881, 882, 926-928*.

Suggestions as to the constitution of the local body to whom the management of the pier should be transferred by the Board of Works; the town commissioners, if established, would be competent for the purpose, and there might be one or two representatives from the board of guardians, *Glynn 383-399, 931-945, 957-964*.

Objection to the exclusive use of the pier by the steamship companies, as giving them a monopoly of trade; statement hereon as to the depth of water at different parts of the pier, *Glynn 900-905, 959-972*—Influential representations made to the Board of Works as to the want of better accommodation for local traders, without exclusive privileges to the steamboat companies; willingness of the Board to transfer the management to a local body, *ib. 916, 923-926, 956-958*.

Decided want of an extension of the pier and the quay space; great local advantage by extension into deep water, *Glynn 960-963, 989-972, 977-982*—Explanation that a representation of the board of guardians of Kilrush in the management of the Cappa Pier would be objected to, it being proposed to vest the pier entirely in the new town commissioners, *ib. 1453, 1464*.

See also *Vandeleur, Mr.*

Kilteery. Commencement in May 1841, and completion in July 1842, of the Kilteery Pier Works; pier added at the land end of the pier in 1844, *Green 10*—Total cost of the works; proportion paid by grant and by the local proprietors, *Green 23, 24; App. 70*.

Amount of receipt and expenditure during the whole period since the completion of the works and in the years 1880 to 1884 inclusive; also amount of traffic and receipts in 1884 as compared with the expenditure, *Green 35-39, 40**; *App. 70*—No toll is now collected, *Green 40**.

Requirement of some slight repairs at Kilteery Pier; class into which this pier has fallen, no tolls being now collected, *Green 79, 80*.

Return of quayside and wharfage rates under the Shannon Navigation Act, *App. 69-70*.

L. inserick

L.

Limerick. Much larger vessels which can discharge at Limerick than at Foynes, *Green* 259-262.

Universal desire of the citizens of Limerick that Foynes Harbour should be vested in the Limerick Harbour Board, *O'Mara* 1108-1110.—Way in which the members of the board are elected; excellent management by them in Limerick Harbour, *ib.* 1111-1113, 1197, 1198.

Resources of the Limerick Harbour Board for the improvement of Foynes; considerable expenditure by the board on the navigation of the Shannon, *O'Mara* 1129-1135, 1159, 1199, 1200.—Considerable and increasing trade of Limerick; limit to the size of the vessels which go up to the harbour, *ib.* 1147-1154, 1187-1189, 1191, 1197.

Limited extent to which the Limerick Harbour Board are responsible for the navigation of the Shannon, *Lord Montagu* 1274-1280.

Particulars as to the great increase in the trade of Limerick since the transfer of the harbour from the Board of Works to the Harbour Board; two-fold increase of tonnage and of dues, though the rates or charges have been considerably reduced, *MacDonnell* 1333-1337, 1375-1377.—Access to Limerick of vessels of about 2,000 tons; much larger vessels which came up as far as Foynes, *ib.* 1338-1342, 1378-1384.

Total of about 78,779 l. borrowed by the Harbour Board from Government since 1868, of which 48,925 l. has since been repaid, with interest, *MacDonnell* 1367, 1368, 1389-1391, 1397.—Great want of railway communication with Limerick harbour; steps proposed to be taken in the matter by the Harbour Board, *ib.* 1387, 1388.

Petition from the Limerick Harbour Commissioners setting forth certain reasons for the transfer of Foynes Harbour to the Commissioners, and praying for the amendment of the Bill on certain points, *App.* 71-73.

See also Foynes.

Local Authorities. Opinion that it may be left to the Board of Works to arrange as to the bodies to whom the piers are transferred, acceptance of the trust being voluntary, *Green* 299-305, 379-374.—Approval in letter from the Board of Works in August 1881 of a transference of the piers and harbours in the Lower Shannon to the local authorities, *ib.* 347.

Approval generally of the principle of transferring the piers and harbours to local bodies or authorities, *Lord Montagu* 1024-1028.—Suggestion that it be made clear in the present Bill that local authorities cannot be forced into taking over the piers, *ib.* 1019-1023.

See also Clare Castle, 9. Foynes, 4. Kilrush.

Local Contributions (Cost of Piers). Amount of contribution by the district in the case of Kilrush, Killadyseri, and Clare Castle, *App.* 70.

Amount of contribution by proprietors in the case of each pier, *App.* 70.

M.

MacDonnell, Robert. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Since its formation in 1868 witness has been a member of the Limerick Harbour Board, 1309-1331.—He supplies particulars as to the great increase in the trade of Limerick since the transfer of the harbour from the Board of Works to the Harbour Board; two-fold increase of tonnage and of dues, through the rates or charges have been considerably reduced, 1333-1337, 1375-1377.

Access to Limerick of vessel of about 2,000 tons; much larger vessels which came up as far as Foynes, 1338-1342, 1378-1384.—Opinion that extended accommodation at Foynes could best be provided at the original site named, at the time of the Commission of 1851; 1343-1344.—Conclusion that it would be an advantage to Limerick as well as to Foynes if large ships could discharge, or partly discharge, at the latter harbour; denial that there would be any rivalry between the two places, or any injury to the trade of Foynes, if the new pier were under the Limerick Harbour Board, 1345 *et seq.*

Unanimous desire of the Limerick Harbour Board to take charge of Foynes harbour and to develop it in the interest of Foynes as well as of Limerick; ample funds available for new works and for maintenance, 1349 *et seq.*—Advantage to the small local towns by the development of Foynes by the Harbour Board of Limerick, 1350-1357.—Total of about 78,779 l. borrowed by the Harbour Board from Government since 1868, of which 48,925 l. has since been repaid, with interest, 1367, 1368, 1389-1391, 1397.

Relative dues or rates at Limerick and at Foynes; it is not proposed to raise the charges for the use of Foynes Harbour, when improved, 1359-1360.—Approval of Foynes having one or two representatives at the Limerick Harbour Board, if the proposed transfer be carried out, 1371, 1372.—Belief that there is no local body to take charge of Foynes harbour, 1385.—Objection to its transfer to a private individual, 183.

MacDonnell, Robert. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

although Lord Montagu may be desirous to do all that is required; his successor might sell the pier to the railway company, 1385, 1386.

Grant want of railway communication with Limerick harbour; steps proposed to be taken in the matter of the Harbour Board, 1387, 1388—Non-objection to a clause in the Bill providing that the works at Foynes shall not be allowed to get into disrepair, 1394, 1395.

Montagu, The Right Honourable Lord. (Analysis of his Evidence).—Witness is owner of all the land within a mile of Foynes harbour, whilst his grandfather contributed some 4,000 l. towards the construction of the works, 983-990. 1054—The harbour has never been the smallest benefit to witness or his predecessors, 991.

Grounds for the conclusion that the harbour could not be transferred with advantage to the county authority, or any local authority; that is, on account mainly of the difficulty as to funds for its improvement and maintenance, 992-999. 1005. 1050-1052. 1065. 1086—Small population and business at Foynes; development expected if the harbour be improved, 996. 1053-1057. 1065-1107.

Willingness of witness to take over the harbour from the Board of Works (though he would prefer that some local authority did so), and to expend money in developing it; necessary benefit thereby to the locality generally as well as to himself, 999-1003. 1016-1020. 1060-1064. 1093-1097. 1106, 1107—Proposed extension of the pier into deep water, the cost being estimated at about 5,000 l.; 1000-1003. 1043-1045. 1064-1064. 1098, 1104—Large outlay necessary if dredging be carried out, witness submitting that this is so much money thrown away, 1004. 1041-1046. 1081-1083. 1098.

Evidence adverse to the transfer of the harbour to the Limerick Harbour Board; apprehension lest Foynes would not thereby be sufficiently developed as a commercial harbour, as it would be a rival port to Limerick, 1006-1011. 1031-1033. 1047. 1073. 1086-1092—Objection also to Foynes harbour being vested in the Waterford and Limerick Railway Company; doubt as to their being prepared to find the necessary capital for its extension, 1012. 1058, 1059.

Disapproval of the harbour being vested in a body comprising witnesses and representatives of the Limerick Harbour Board and the railway company; difficulty in such body raising money on security of the harbour dues or otherwise, 1013-1015—Reference to Courtown Harbour (Wexford) as having been handed over by the Board of Works to Lord Courtown, 1016, 1019.

Approval generally of the principle of transferring the piers and harbours to local bodies or authorities, 1014-1018—Suggestion that it be made clear in the present Bill that local authorities cannot be forced into taking over the piers, 1009-1022—Suggestion also as to trustees being empowered to raise money on collateral security in respect of piers vested in them, 1023-1034.

Expediency of some provision as to the Board of Works putting the piers in proper order before transferring them, 1034—Proposal as to the local authorities in charge of harbours reporting to the Board of Trade instead of to the Board of Works in Dublin, 1034-1035—Approval of special rates being named for each scheme transferred, with power in the local body to alter them within limits, 1038-1040.

Deposit of silt at the end of Foynes Pier since the last dredging three years ago, 1046—Fairly good state of the pier at the present time, 1049—Objection to a local body (not a public authority) comprising representatives of different classes and interests; difficulty as to their raising the funds required for extending the pier, 1063-1071—Feeling of the trades in favour of an independent authority, 1072, 1073.

Commercial and shipping advantages of Foynes as compared with Limerick in the event of Foynes Harbour being sufficiently extended, 1074-1080. 1088-1092. 1099-1105—Report by a Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1851 in favour of Foynes as a trans-Atlantic packet station; very moderate outlay required for the purpose, 1099, 1100—Small vessels now able to enter the harbour; very large ships to be accommodated by the proposed extension, 1102-1104.

[Second Examination].—Explanation respecting the site originally chosen for Foynes Harbour; its advantages and disadvantages as compared with the site eventually selected, 1200-1206—Conclusion as to the development of the harbour and trade of Foynes being necessarily a benefit to witness as owner of the adjoining lands, 1237-1245—Further statement as to the small trade of the place, only one person, Mr. Walsh, doing a large business, 1246-1250. 1300-1306.

Conclusion further expressed as to the unsuitableness of the local sanitary authority to take charge of the harbour and to raise money for its improvement, 1251, 1252. 1259, 1280. 1297—Concurrence in the view that the Board of Works should put the harbour into good repair before it is handed over, 1253-1255—Agreement also in the view that it should be optional in the local authority to undertake the maintenance of the pier, 1256.

Doubt

Monteagle, The Right Honourable Lord. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—continued.

Doubt whether the county of Limerick have been asked or have declined to take over the harbour, 1257, 1258.—Property other than land which witness might desire to offer as collateral security for the money required, 1261.—Further examination in support of witness' objection to the harbour being placed under the Limerick Harbour Board; interest of the latter under certain circumstances in not sufficiently developing it, 1262 *et seq.*

Doubt as to American liners or small packets being induced to come to Foynes, 1268-1273.—Limited extent to which the Limerick Harbour Board are responsible for the navigation of the Shannon, 1274-1280.—Exception taken to a proposal that Foynes might have a representative at the harbour board, 1298-1306.—Saving feasible on the score of dredging whereby the expenditure might be reduced to the level of the receipts; uselessness of the dredging hitherto, 1307-1310.—Large outlay entailed by the extension of the pier, this not affecting the silt already in the harbour, 1311-1314.—Increased tonnage of vessels to be accommodated according to the length of the extension, 1315-1317.

Explanation that any land required for the extension of the harbour is already in the possession of witness, 1318-1323.—Special circumstances under which witness considers that the local authorities in charge of harbours should report to the Board of Trade, 1326-1328.

[Third Examination.]—Statement purporting to show that there is no analogy between the case of Foynes and Limerick and that of Queenstown, Passage, and Cork, as regards the question of the transfer of Foynes harbour to the Limerick Harbour Board, 1455, 1456.

Explanation in reply to a statement as to the speculative character of the contribution to Foynes pier by witness' predecessor, 1457.—Inaccuracy of a statement as to the possible transfer of the pier to a railway company if it were voted in witness, 1458, 1459.—Decided feeling in the local towns adverse to transfer to the Limerick Harbour Board, 1459, 1460.

O.

O'Connell, John. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Witness is a civil engineer, and is familiar with the old quay and new pier at Clare Castle, 634-640, 725, 726.—He has not seen the plans for the extension of the new pier, and is not prepared to speak as to their effect, 641, 642.

Grounds for the conclusion that the failure of the new pier is owing to the selection of a foundation which is naturally bad, and to the piles resting upon mud, 643-661, 667-669, 700-708, 725-733, 740-748, 772-776.—Doubt as to any landslip having caused the failure of the works; reference hereon to the weight of a large quantity of timber stored on the quay, 651-663, 725-733, 772-776.—Tendency of dredging in front of the new pier to render the foundations still more insecure; security if they had been taken down at first to the solid rock, 664-669, 703-708, 738-740.

Suggestions for the constitution of the local body or harbour authority for Clare Castle; proposed selection in the first instance of merchants and shippers of Ennis, 670, 671, 712-715, 724.—Expediency of the rates or dues being increased up to the level of the Limerick rates, and of the local authority being empowered to expend them in improving the navigation of the River Fergus, 672-691, 711, 721-723, 734-737.—Much greater importance of expenditure in the removal of obstructions to the navigation than on the new pier at Clare Castle; direct representation by witness of shippers and merchants of Ennis to the foregoing effect, 674-678, 683-691, 702-711.

Necessity of heavy expenditure if, instead of outlay on the new pier, it had been decided to deepen the river at the old quay, 693-696.—Very worse state of the new pier structure at the present time; danger of its falling into the bed of the river, 699-697, 725-727.—Went of the old pier as well as the new pier for the accommodation of the different classes of vessels, 716-719.

Difficulty of witness in estimating the cost of the works required for remedying the defects of the new pier; preference for an entirely different site and for a new work altogether, 720, 740-771, 777-779.—Explanation of the new structure contemplated by witness, he not having prepared any plan or estimate nor considered the matter in detail, 749-771, 777-779.

Advantage if the whole of the River Fergus, as well as the port of Ennis (Clare Castle), were placed under the proposed local authority, and if the dues were equalised as compared with Limerick, 780-784.—Suggestion that a temporary wooden structure might be provided so as to accommodate vessels in deep water, 784.—Objection to wooden foundations under such local circumstances as at Clare Castle, 785.

O'Connell, Francis. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Considerable experience of witness as a civil engineer; he is well conversant with Clare Castle new pier, 789-794.—Decided opinion that the pier is a constant source of danger to the navigation, and may at any time fall into the river, 794-796, 803.—Conclusion that the failure of the pier is entirely due to defective foundations, and not to any landslip; the piles, in fact, were not driven sufficiently deep, 797-816, 829-831, 840-842.—Perfect waste of money in trying to repair the pier; further failure anticipated, 806, 808, 839-836.

Manifest injustice in transferring the pier to a local body, together with a charge of some 7,000 £; 817.—Suggestions as to the constitution and mode of election of the local body to whom the Clare Castle pier (free of liability) might be transferred; there should be a great majority of importers and exporters of Limerick, 818-828.

Opinion that the best plan would be to build a new pier higher up the river, which might be built in masonry for 2,000 £; 836, 844-846.—Advantage, for some years, of a wooden structure, or of an iron structure with screw piles; this should be at a new site, 837-839.

O'Mara, Stephen. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Witness, who is mayor of Limerick, testifies to the universal desire of the citizens that Foynes Harbour should be vested in the Limerick Harbour Board, 1108-1110.—Way in which the members of the Board are elected; excellent management by them of Limerick Harbour, 1111-1113, 1197, 1198.

Evidence strongly in favour of Foynes Harbour being transferred to the Limerick Harbour Board rather than to Lord Montagu; denial that the Board would be actuated by any feeling of rivalry, it being to the interest of Limerick to develop the trade of Foynes as an auxiliary port, 1114, *et seq.*—Benefit to Limerick as well as to Foynes if the latter port were developed into a trans-Atlantic packet station, 1121-1125.

Resources of the Limerick Harbour Board for the improvement of Foynes; considerable expenditure by the board on the navigation of the Shannon, 1129-1135, 1183, 1199, 1200.—Very large vessels which could come to Foynes if the pier be extended; small boats now using the harbour, 1136-1143, 1152-1155.—Considerable and increasing trade of Limerick; limit to the size of the vessels which go up to the harbour, 1147-1154, 1167-1169, 1191, 1192.

Benefit to the small towns in the vicinity by the improvement of Foynes, 1202-1204.—Objection to Lord Montagu being, in view of the local interests, represented on the body to whom the harbour is transferred; approval of a representative of the importers and exporters of Foynes, 1205-1207.—Improvement of Lord Montagu's property if the harbour and port be developed by the action of the Limerick Harbour Board, 1213-1215.

Q.

Querrin. Commencement and completion in 1841 of Querrin pier, which is situated on the north side of the Shannon estuary, *Green* 14, 11.—Total cost of the works; proportion paid by grant and by the local proprietors, *Green* 25; *App.* 70.

Amount of receipt and expenditure during the whole period since the completion of the works, and in the years 1880 to 1884, inclusive; also, amount of traffic and receipts in 1884 compared with the expenditure, *Green* 35, 39, 45-48; *App.* 70.—Inexpensive repairs required at Querrin pier, the estimated cost being 16 £; *Green* 84.

R.

Rates (Dues or Tolls). Explanations respecting the rates or tolls charged for the use of the piers, these being similar to the tolls in the schedule to the present Bill, *Green* 93-99.—Reduced rates payable by steamboats constantly using the piers in the Shannon, *ib.* 264-266.

Approval of special rates being framed for each scheme transferred, with power in the local body to alter them within limits, *Lord Montagu* 1038-1040.

Receipts from dues or tolls at each pier in different periods, *App.* 70.

See also *Clare Castle*, 3. *Foynes*, 6.

Receipts and Expenditure. Information respecting the receipts and expenditure in each case for the whole period since the completion of the works to the end of 1884, for the five years 1880-84 and for the year 1884, separately, *Green* 33-57; *App.* 70.

See also *Expenditure*, *Rates*.

Report, 1885—continued.

S.

Saloon. Situation of Saloon pier or quay, the works having been completed in 1844-45; the pier can only be approached by boats after half tide, *Green* 10—Total cost of the works; proportion paid by grant and by the local proprietors, *Green* 24, 25; *App.* 70.

Amount of receipt and expenditure during the whole period since the completion of the works, and in the years 1880 to 1884, inclusive; also amount of traffic and receipts in 1884 as compared with the expenditure, *Green* 35, 39, 45, 46; *App.* 70—Very limited extent to which any repairs are required at Saloon Pier, *Green* 81-83.

Shannon Improvements. Appropriation of 584,807 l. for Shannon improvements by the Act 2 & 3 Vict. in 1839; principle of joint contribution by the Government, the counties, and the local proprietors, *Green* 6-10.

Silt. See *Clare Castle*, 3. *Dredging.* *Foynes*, 3.

Steamers. See *Dues or Tolls.* *Kilrush.*

T.

Traffic. Amount of traffic and of receipts at the several piers as compared with the expenditure in 1884; distinction between traffic outwards and inwards, *Green* 40-57; *App.* 70.

Transfer of Piers. Different piers proposed to be transferred to the counties or to local authorities, *Green* 100-102.

See also *Clare Castle*, 3. *Foynes*, 4. *Kilrush.* *Local Authorities.*

Trustees. Suggestion also as to trustees being empowered to raise money on collateral security in respect of piers vested in them, *Lord Montagu* 1032-1034.

See also *Foynes*, 4.

V.

Vandeleur, Mr. Desire of Mr. Vandeleur, the principal landowner, for an extension of the pier at Kilrush; doubt whether he would be disposed to act as trustee, *Green* 972-976.

W.

Waterford and Limerick Railway Company. See *Foynes*, 4.